



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**'FIERABRAS' IN IRELAND - THE TRANSMISSION AND
CULTURAL SETTING OF A FRENCH EPIC IN THE MEDIEVAL
IRISH LITERARY TRADITION**

Michael Howard Davies

PhD

The University of Edinburgh

1995



ABSTRACT

Thirteenth-century France saw the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris to house the Crown of Thorns and other Relics of the Passion which had been purchased by King Louis IX. As a result, a fictitious history that explained how Charlemagne had rescued these Relics from the Saracens and brought them to Paris gained widespread popularity in later medieval France. This history was in the form of an epic poem entitled the *Chanson de Fierabras*, of which English translations were also made. The history was, in addition, taken to Ireland, where the Irish translation, *Sdair Fortibrais* developed a wide circulation. However, the Irish text had as its source a Latin translation of the French epic poem. This Latin text is preserved only partially in a unique Irish manuscript of the fifteenth century. It is assumed to be the work of an Irish cleric due to the non-appearance of this version of the story outside Ireland. Hitherto unedited, the principal aim of this project is to provide an edition of the Latin text that lies between the French epic and the Irish text, and then to discuss the position of the story in the Irish literary tradition.

The first part of this thesis is entitled 'The Irish Fierabras - the Historical and Literary Framework', divided into five chapters. The first chapter asks why a certain selection of literary texts were translated into Irish during the later Middle Ages, and how they were representing the literary tastes of contemporary France. A comparison is then made with the translation literature of English, Welsh and Old Norse, leading to the conclusion that the history of the Relics of the Passion was the major reason for the interest in the Fierabras story in Ireland as in England. The second chapter outlines the spread of the Fierabras story in France, England and Ireland from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, noting any political reasons as to why the story may have been popular at any one time. The third chapter considers how the subjects of the Fierabras story were used elsewhere in the Irish tradition in order to see if any political interpretations may be applied. The results are inconclusive. The fourth chapter demonstrates that the Irish text is a close translation of the Latin, which is itself an economical translation of the French poem. The final chapter notes how the Latin text can be considered a scholastic text of the early fourteenth century, and asks if it was the work of one particular author, by comparison with another datable text.

The second part, 'Manuscript, Text and Translation', is centred upon the edition of the Latin text. The edition presents the text as it is written in the manuscript, with appropriate emendations - an 'editio princeps'. The title of the text in the manuscript, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, is preserved. The edition is prefaced by a description of the manuscript, along with the editorial principles. It is noted how the text is preserved on one quire that would probably have been followed by a similar quire, now lost. The edition is followed by a textual apparatus, in which the editorial corrections are explained, and some further notes. A reasonably literal translation lies at the end, in which the difficulties in the Latin text are clarified as far as possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I wish to acknowledge the efforts of my supervisor, Professor William Gillies of the Celtic Department of the University of Edinburgh. Throughout the preparation of this thesis, his assistance and direction in all areas have been invaluable. I would especially like to thank him for the benefit of his Latin learning during the preparation of the edition of the text *Gesta Karoli Magni*, and also for his illuminating comments made during the preparation of the introductory chapters.

I would also like to acknowledge Professor Donald Meek, now of the Celtic Department of the University of Aberdeen, for his guidance during the preparatory stages of the work. Additionally, I should like to thank the following members of the Celtic Department of the University of Edinburgh for their help with the Celtic languages, the presentation of editions, and general thesis structure: Mr. Ronald Black, Dr. Thomas Clancy, Dr. Nerys Ann Jones and Mr. Robbie Mullally.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the following scholars for the benefit of their knowledge: Professor Marvin Colker of the Classics Department of the University of Virginia for his information about T.C.D. MS. 667; Professor Kenneth Fowler, formerly of the History Department of the University of Edinburgh, for his overviews of later medieval history; and Mr. Allan Hood of the Classics Department of the University of Edinburgh for his insight into the history of later medieval Latin.

CONTENTS

<u>Introduction</u>		1
Part One	The Irish Fierabras - The Historical and Literary Framework	11
<u>Chapter One</u>	The Insular Representation of the 'Matters' of Old French Literature	12
Section One	Irish 'Matter' Translations and the Literature of Medieval France	12
Section Two	The 'Matter' Translations in English, Welsh and Old Norse	47
<u>Chapter Two</u>	The Fierabras Story in the Literature of France, England and Ireland	75
Section One	The <i>Chanson de Fierabras</i> and the Relics of the Passion in Later Medieval France	75
Section Two	The Later Medieval Derivatives of the <i>Chanson de Fierabras</i> in France, England and Ireland	100
<u>Chapter Three</u>	France, The Saracens and the Relics in the Writings of Later Medieval Ireland	130
<u>Chapter Four</u>	<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i> - The French Source and Irish Derivative	186
Section One	<i>Sdair Fortibrais</i> - An Irish Translation of <i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	186
Section Two	Identifying a Chanson de Geste Source for <i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	204
Section Three	<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i> - A Translation from the <i>Chanson de Fierabras</i>	218
<u>Chapter Five</u>	<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i> - A Specimen of Fourteenth-Century Hiberno-Latin	245
Section One	The Latinity of the Author of <i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	245
Section Two	<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i> and the Latinity of Simon Semeonis	264
<u>Conclusion to Part One</u>		275

Part Two	Manuscript, Text and Translation	279
Section One	Previous Scholarship on T.C.D. MS. 667 and <i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	280
Section Two	T.C.D. MS. 667 - Notes on the Codex and the Script	285
Section Three	The Quire Containing <i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	293
<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	Comments on the Manuscript Text	299
<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	Editorial Principles	302
<u>Hic Incipiunt <i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i> et cetera.</u>		304
<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	Textual Apparatus	368
<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	Translation	384
Appendices		429
<u>Appendix One</u>	Manuscripts Containing the <i>Chanson de Fierabras</i> and its Derivative Versions	430
<u>Appendix Two</u>	The Names of <i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i> and <i>Sdair Fortibrais</i> , and their Equivalents in French and English <i>Fierabras</i> Texts	440
Bibliography		469

INTRODUCTION

The overall aim of this thesis is to make a contribution to the study of how the literary developments in France from the twelfth to the early sixteenth century influenced the literature of Ireland during the same period. In Northern Europe, these centuries approximate to the later Middle Ages historically and the Gothic Age artistically. Gothic Art was propagated in France during the twelfth century, and led to the development of more innovative architectural practises, and to the flourishing of vernacular literature in French. The Gothic styles matured in France and were developed further in the neighbouring countries of Western Europe until the arrival in the North during the sixteenth century of the classically-derived Renaissance ideals. Gothic art was to become particularly influential in the places where French culture predominated among the aristocracy, notably England.

From the twelfth century, Ireland fell increasingly under the influence of this French-based culture. The primary causes were the conquest and settlement of Ireland and the Gaelic Irish by a French-speaking aristocracy from England, and the establishment in Ireland of monastic houses of the continental orders. These factors added impetus to the spread of the Gothic ideals over Ireland. During the course of the later Middle Ages, this influence was particularly profound upon the realm of literature. Foremost among the literary testimonies to this influence is a series of translations concerning some of the most important subjects of the literature of later medieval France. This thesis takes its focus from this group of texts that were translated and copied between the twelfth and early sixteenth centuries, a period at the end of which the Reformation of the English church and subsequent revolts in Ireland led to a new era in Irish history.

The means for making this contribution include the proximate aim of presenting an 'editio princeps' of a Latin prose translation of the late twelfth-century *chanson de*

geste, the *Chanson de Fierabras*, and discussing it. This Latin translation lies mid-way between the French and Irish literary traditions, as it was itself used as the source for the Irish translation *Sdair Fortibrais*, datable to around 1400. The story is part of the fictitious history of the wars of Charlemagne against the Saracens, and recounts how the Relics of the Passion, including the Crown of Thorns, were rescued from the Saracens and brought to rest in St. Denis. In France, this story was able to provide an excellent promotion for the Sainte-Chapelle, the masterpiece of thirteenth-century Gothic architecture that had been constructed to accommodate these Relics. In acknowledgement of the importance of this story, the Irish translation became one of the most popular of all the texts translated from a foreign source into Irish during the later Middle Ages.

Unlike the Irish translation, which is comparatively well represented in the manuscript tradition of the fifteenth century, the Latin text is only partially preserved in one fifteenth-century manuscript. This manuscript was compiled in all probability at a Franciscan friary in County Clare, and is now preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin as Manuscript No. 667, formerly F.5.3.. The Irish translation, *Sdair Fortibrais*, is the only other representation of this version of the story anywhere in Europe, and it will be argued that it is reasonable to assume that the Latin text is Hiberno-Latin, made by an Irishman for the transmission of the story to Ireland. In combination with *Sdair Fortibrais*, it may thus be considered as the main representation of the Fierabras story in the Irish literary tradition.

The present enquiry into the Fierabras story in Ireland originated in a more general survey of a specific group of the translations made into Irish from foreign sources during the later Middle Ages. These texts are all stories that fit into one of the three 'Matters', that is the 'Matter of Rome', the 'Matter of France' and the 'Matter of Britain', which predominated in the secular narrative literature of France during the later

Middle Ages. This class encompasses all the translated stories that can be considered as epic, romance or historiography, but excludes the translations of hagiographic texts or purely descriptive, non-literary accounts of voyages. The translations in this class are of two sorts of provenance: the first incorporates texts translated from Latin, either classical epics or late classical prose histories; the second involves texts translated from later medieval English romances. Note that there are no extant examples of any translations having been made directly from a French source during the later Middle Ages. This may appear somewhat surprising, as the French cultural sphere had extended over all the British Isles as a result of Norman activity during this period, and French literature had become popular among the ruling classes. But although a number of the Irish translations have French texts as their ultimate source, in all cases bar one there is an intermediary text that is an English romance. The one exception is *Sdair Fortibrais*, which is translated from a Latin text, itself a rare example of translation from French verse into Latin prose. Hence, these two texts of the Fierabras story have a unique position in the extant Irish tradition.

A notable omission in the existing scholarship was revealed in the course of this survey. All the Irish translations within the scope of the study had been at some stage edited, as indeed had versions of all bar one of the source texts in Latin and English. The exception was the Latin source of *Sdair Fortibrais*. The examination of this text became both an urgent priority within this investigation, and also a pointer to the form that this thesis should finally take, built around an edition of this barely studied Latin text. T.C.D. MS. 667 did not prove to be overly difficult to read or study from a codicological point of view. The text was transcribed from the original manuscript, which was examined and described in June 1992. The resulting edition, presented in Part Two of this project, entitled 'Manuscript, Text and Translation', is diplomatic, the text being laid out as in the manuscript, with each line of the manuscript text appearing as a line in the printed edition. The edition is prefaced by codicological and

palaeographical notes, and a statement of the editorial principles. A fairly literal translation is also provided. One of the problems was knowing what title to give the edited text. The title of the text in the manuscript, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, is used throughout this thesis, even though it does not contain the expected reference to the eponymous hero of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. It must be noted here that although the editor of the Irish translation names the text *Sdair Fortibrais*, the manuscripts actually entitle the text *Sdair Serluis Mhóir*, again with no reference to Fierabras/Fortibras.

Examination of the Latin and Irish texts quickly revealed that *Sdair Fortibrais* is a very close translation of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The two texts, taken together, permit the placing of the Irish Fierabras tradition in its cultural setting in the later Middle Ages. In order to achieve this goal, there are five basic questions that require to be answered. The first three concern the literary context of the text: The first question asks how the Irish tradition of the Fierabras story compares with the Irish tradition of other comparable 'Matter' translations; the second then enquires how the Irish Fierabras texts compare to those of the other countries, France and England, in which the story was represented; the third asks how the subjects presented in the Fierabras story were employed in later medieval Irish literature, and how they could have been interpreted by the contemporary reader. The other two concern aspects of language and style: the fourth question asks if the respective translators of *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gesta Karoli Magni* treated their source texts faithfully, or if the sources were freely adapted; the fifth then enquires about the characteristics of the Latin used in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, and asks if this type of Latin can help identify the translator of the text. The answers to all these questions form the chapters of Part One of this project, entitled 'The Irish Fierabras - The Historical and Literary Framework', which discusses the background and context of the Irish Fierabras tradition.

The first question, which asks about the Fierabras story in relation to the other Irish translations of 'Matter' texts, required a proper critical survey of the relevant Irish texts that showed which texts had been translated into Irish from which sources. This survey is presented in the first section of Part One, Chapter One. By setting the Irish translations against the wider field of French 'Matter' texts, the survey points to certain literary and scholastic developments in France which explain both the motivation behind and the choice of texts translated. The Irish selection comprises a larger group of 'Matter of Rome' texts concerning the ancient world of which most were translated during, or even before, the twelfth century; a smaller, later group of 'Matter of France' translations that centre upon Charlemagne and the Saracen wars; and a final, small group of 'Matter of Britain' translations concerning Arthurian and English heroes. The texts of the last two 'Matters' date for the most part from the fifteenth century; the Relics of the Passion, notably the Crown of Thorns and the Holy Grail, were important features in the choice of texts from these 'Matters' to be translated.

As an adjunct to the survey of the Irish translations, it proved expedient to consider the translations into the other language groups of the British Isles (English, Welsh and Old Norse). This comparative survey, presented in the second section of Chapter One, addresses the question as to whether the Irish translation tradition was operating independently, or as part of a wider process. The results show that superficially the British traditions are not the same as that of Ireland, the Irish tradition paralleling that of France, especially around the twelfth century when there was no discernible 'Matter' translation occurring in Britain. However there are also some notable similarities that could be missed at first sight between the fourteenth and fifteenth-century translation traditions of England and Ireland, especially following the introduction of printing. It is also established that the Fierabras story was being read and copied in England at approximately the same time as in Ireland. Also noted is a striking similarity between

the thirteenth-century traditions of Wales and Norway which was not reflected in Ireland.

The second question, which asks about the Irish Fierabras tradition in relation to those of France and England, exposed an interesting feature of previous scholarship. This was that while the tradition of the Fierabras story in areas outside Ireland had received some considerable attention by earlier scholars, the Irish tradition had been left almost totally unexamined. Part of the reason for this was the fact that earlier scholars had mostly focused their attention upon the primitive origins of the Fierabras story, and upon the linguistic aspects of the texts, whereas there has been relatively little work on why this story was popular in the later Middle Ages. How important a subject in its own right was the fate of the Relics of the Passion? How important were political and ideological considerations such as the representation of French unity against a common foe? For other, quite comparable texts could be adduced to show how contemporary politics may be expressed through the medium of heroic literature.

This enquiry forms Part One, Chapter Two, and it relates the texts and their manuscript contexts to the historical events of the respective periods in an attempt to estimate how far political interpretations could have been applied to the text. The first section of Chapter Two describes how the fame of the Relics in the Sainte-Chapelle helped to spread the Fierabras story in the thirteenth century, but how the text was also used to promote the concept of a united France leading the vanguard of Christendom in the crusades. The second section discusses the prose adaptations and the translations of the Fierabras story dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Here, the political interpretations that can be read into each version are considered, and it is stressed how it is worth considering the Irish tradition of the Fierabras story against the political background of the fifteenth century. A text championing France in the time of Charlemagne could be read in a variety of ways in an area that had a volatile relationship

with England, the long time enemy of France. A feature of this section is the discussion of the most likely date when *Gesta Karoli Magni* may have been translated from the French. Circumstantial evidence suggests a date in the early fourteenth century, but this is not beyond doubt.

The third question, which asks how the subjects of the Fierabras story were used and potentially interpreted in the later medieval Irish literary tradition, has been answered in Part One, Chapter Three. The Fierabras story contains three major subjects, these being France, the Saracens and the Relics of the Passion. These subjects are also found in a number of different texts which were extant in the literature of Ireland during the later Middle Ages. However, no previous research has considered their usage in any detail. Consequently, this question is answered by means of a survey of the texts which were being first written and then copied in later medieval Ireland that make use of some or all of the same subjects as the Fierabras story. This survey starts by considering in detail the use of the subjects under consideration in both *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*, and then proceeds to discuss the comparanda in both relevant languages, that is Hiberno-Latin and Irish. The comparanda consist of two basic types, annals and narrative texts. As is to be expected, a large number of the Irish narrative comparanda are also translations that concern French and Middle Eastern topics.

As this survey deals with the detailed study of primary source material, the results are fairly extensive. However, the chapter is not divided into separate sections for presentational purposes. The aim is to gain a complete overview of what is essentially one study. This survey assesses the information available to the later medieval Irish readers of both Latin and the vernacular concerning these subjects, and asks if any light can be shed upon the way in which this presentation would have been interpreted by the readers of a particular time during the period. This study, of course, does not exhaust this topic; a complete survey of all the subjects of later medieval Irish literature would

be needed for that. What is does show is that *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* were quite typical within the literature of later medieval Ireland in the portrayal of the subjects under consideration. Nevertheless, it would be difficult to be very precise about the potential political interpretations of any one text.

The fourth question asks directly about the relationship of *Gesta Karoli Magni* with both its presumed translation, *Sdair Fortibrais*, and its presumed source, the *Chanson de Fierabras*. What was required was a comparison between the three texts to illustrate the manner of translation adopted by each translator. The easiest comparison to effect was that between *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*. The process of editing *Gesta Karoli Magni* had suggested that the Irish text was a close translation of the Latin, so much so that the paragraph divisions employed by the editor of *Sdair Fortibrais* could also be applied to *Gesta Karoli Magni*. A formal comparison of a carefully selected group of paragraphs is presented in the first section of Part One, Chapter Four, in which it is shown that the translator of *Sdair Fortibrais* followed his source faithfully, omitting only what was considered to be unnecessary detail. This comparison is followed by a further list of detailed passages of the Latin text that were truncated in translation.

The second comparison of texts needed to be between *Gesta Karoli Magni* and its source text. The survey of all the texts containing the Fierabras story asks explicitly whether *Gesta Karoli Magni* was itself translated from the original French chanson de geste, or from some other version of the story. Although the chanson de geste has been considered to be the source text by earlier scholars, this has never been formally demonstrated. By comparing the forms of proper nouns in the various texts, the source text is shown categorically in the second section of Chapter Four to be the French version of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. The names from *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* that clearly demonstrate their deriving from the French chanson de geste are

listed alongside their equivalents from this text and, where relevant, from the Anglo-Norman and other daughter versions of the text. Following this illustration, the third section of Chapter Four presents a comparison of the Latin and French texts again using a selection of the paragraphs from *Gesta Karoli Magni* (and *Sdair Fortibrais* for the second half of the story) with the appropriate laisses of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. The comparison shows a very economical method of translation was employed, reducing the original story to an account of the facts and the principal details.

The fifth and final question finally enquires about the Latinity of the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. This question was answered by means of a survey of the typical sentence structures and constructions used in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. It was hoped that the Latin would reveal some features that could be considered as characteristic 'Hibernicisms' of the later Middle Ages, rendering a comparison with other Hiberno-Latin texts of the same period somewhat easier. However, this survey, of which the results form first section of Part One, Chapter Five, produced no obvious Hibernicisms. The Latin used by the translator was the international, scholastic Latin typical of the later Middle Ages that spread from influential institutions such as the University of Paris to all parts of Europe.

Although the internationalism of Latin makes it very difficult to state if the text was typically Irish or not, and a comparison with other Irish texts to examine later medieval Hibernicisms would hence not be productive, it seemed worthwhile to ask whether *Gesta Karoli Magni* was translated by the one particular early fourteenth-century author, Simon Semeonis, whose travelogue, discussed in Chapter Three, utilised the same subjects as *Gesta Karoli Magni*. This idea is investigated by means of a comparison between the Latinity of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and of Simon, a discussion which forms the second section of Chapter Five. Although there are a number of similarities in the

use of Latin between the two texts, they are not sufficient to prove that Simon was the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

With a project such as this there are always a number of potential developments of the study. For example, given the current fashion for discovering political motives for the composition of texts, one is tempted to ask whether the Fierabras story fits into this pattern in both an Irish and a European context. However, the essential tasks of this thesis have been to provide an 'editio princeps' of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and then to establish the particular relationships between the texts of the Fierabras tradition in Ireland with the texts of European Fierabras literature, the texts from Ireland that employ the same subjects as the Fierabras story, and the Irish translation tradition of 'Matter' texts. It is hoped that these objectives have been achieved.

PART ONE

THE IRISH FIERABRAS - THE HISTORICAL AND LITERARY FRAMEWORK

CHAPTER ONE**THE INSULAR REPRESENTATION OF THE
'MATTERS' OF OLD FRENCH LITERATURE****SECTION ONE****IRISH 'MATTER' TRANSLATIONS AND THE
LITERATURE OF MEDIEVAL FRANCE**

'N'en sont que trois materes n'i a nule nome vivant:
De France et de Bretaigne et de Rome la grant;
Ne de ces trois materes n'i a nule samblant.'

This oft-quoted passage from the opening laisse of the *Chanson des Saisnes* by Jehan Bodel¹, written in the last decades of the twelfth century in the Northeast of France², shows the three broad subject 'Matters', known as the 'Matter of Rome', the 'Matter of France', and the 'Matter of Britain', about which new works, often written in verse, of historiography, epic and romance were composed in the Old French language of the twelfth, thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries³.

The texts of these 'Matters' concerned subjects implied by their name: texts of the 'Matter of Rome' concerned subjects of classical antiquity; the 'Matter of France' revolved around earlier French heroes, notably Charlemagne, including the *Chanson de Fierabras*; and the 'Matter of Britain' texts told the stories of British knights, most importantly those of the court of King Arthur. The stories were able to provide the secular aristocracy of France and Norman England with informative works of literature concerning the ancients, and early medieval France and Britain, the subjects which formed the historical and symbolic background to the French-speaking world of the later Middle Ages. The tradition of the 'Matter' texts in the vernacular was inspired by certain key classical and medieval Latin texts in which there had been a

¹ed. A. Brasseur, Geneva, 1989, p.2, l.6-8.

²id., p.ix.

³For a general definition of the 'Matters', see H. Newstead, 'Matter of Britain, Matter of France, Matter of Rome' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.8, New York, 1987, pp.223-6.

later medieval upsurge of interest, particularly in the cathedral schools and scriptoria of Northern France during the eleventh and twelfth centuries⁴.

Following the major socio-economic changes that altered the face of European society from the middle of the fourteenth century, these three 'Matters' continued to be employed, but in a different manner. The Old French verse texts being either re-copied, or re-written in Middle French prose versions, and new Middle French texts were composed, generally in prose⁵. The aims of these prose versions were to provide a large number of romantic and historical texts based upon the traditional aristocratic stories for patrons that included not only the aristocracy, but also the increasingly influential bourgeois classes of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries⁶. The advent of printing in the later fifteenth century gave added impetus to the mass-production of this type of prose literature⁷. Hence, in the period up to the rise of humanist literature⁸, the 'Matters' continued to form the substance of new works, but without any of the poetic artistry employed in the Old French poems.

The categorisation into 'Matters' by Bodel is also important for the study of the secular, literary, narrative texts translated into other languages, including Irish, from a

⁴J.J.Contreni, 'Schools, Cathedral' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.59-63 discusses how the development of urban centres following the period of economic decline in the tenth century led to the schools at the cathedrals gaining educational prominence, particularly in the study of Latin texts. The Île de France based around Paris was the area in which the cathedral schools became the most significant.

⁵The famines and plagues, notably the Black Death of 1348-9 saw a considerable reduction in the European population. With land and food available in abundance after these events, the old-style aristocratic feudal economies started to give way to more market orientated economies, and hence the potential for economic growth among the middle classes developed. In literary terms, this relative decline in the power of the aristocracy saw the market for the artistic verse texts recede, and the desire for prose texts with a greater emphasis on the factual elements increase. These prose texts would appeal to the aristocracy, and also satisfy the need to spread the old 'aristocratic' stories to the bourgeois classes. Discussed by G.Doutrepont, *Les Mises en Prose des Épopées et des Romans Chevaleresques du XIV au XVI Siècle*, Geneva, 1969.

⁶For an overview of the growth of towns in the later Middle Ages, see D.Matthew, *Atlas of Medieval Europe*, Oxford, 1983, pp.120-8.

⁷General summary of the rise of printing by L.Hellings, 'Printing, Origins of' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.10, New York, 1988, pp.124-8.

⁸P.Champion, 'Vue Générale du XVI^e Siècle' in *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - XVI^e Siècle*, Paris, 1964, pp.3-23 discusses the Renaissance and Humanism as the most important changes to occur in sixteenth-century French literature.

foreign source during the later Middle Ages. All the Irish translations made between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries which have a secular, literary and narrative character belong to one the three 'Matters', as indeed do a couple of texts that were probably translated at an earlier date. Although there is only a small number of extant Irish translations, and although none of them were translated directly from a French source, their existence illustrates, to some extent, the influence of the literary trends of France on the later medieval Irish translators and patrons⁹. It is hoped that this section will establish a more precise view of the nature of this influence.

Some of the previous surveys of Irish literature have tended to consider the translations as a group of rather perfunctory texts which show a certain amount of influence of Western Europe upon Ireland¹⁰. This treatment is unsatisfactory, as it does not attempt to explain why certain texts were chosen for translation, and what may have inspired these texts to have been translated at one particular date. By setting the translations in a semi-chronological, semi-thematic manner against the backdrop of French scholastic and literary developments, this section will demonstrate why certain texts were chosen for translation into Irish, and which subjects were of primary interest to them.

⁹The later medieval period of Irish history is outlined by K.Simms, 'The Norman Invasion and the Gaelic Recovery' in R.F.Foster (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland*, Oxford, 1989, pp.53-103. The period is covered in detail by A.Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, Oxford, 1987. This volume deals with Ireland during the years which on a wider European scale started with the rise of vernacular French literature in the twelfth century, and ended with the end the advent of Humanism and the Reformation in regions North of the Alps in the early sixteenth century.

¹⁰This is particularly true of the early survey by D.Hyde, *A Literary History of Ireland*, London, 1899, p.572, where in one paragraph is given a loose list of the translations and adaptations known to him; R. Flower in the 1927 lecture 'Ireland in Medieval Europe' (printed in R.Flower, *The Irish Tradition*, Oxford, 1947, pp.107-41) gives a much fuller list of all types of translated material, showing how Ireland was influenced by European cultural traditions; G.Murphy in *The Ossianic Lore and Romantic Tales of Medieval Ireland*, Dublin, 1955, pp.35-7, gives a somewhat unscientific list of material translated and adapted from continental sources; S.Mac Airt, 'The Development of Early Modern Irish Prose' in B.Ó Cuív (ed.), *Seven Centuries of Irish Learning*, Radio Éireann, Dublin, 1961, pp.124-6, lists in very incomplete fashion the translations in rough chronological order, but states that secular Irish writing was not conscious of European practises; More modern lists are provided by N.Ní Shéaghdha, 'Translations and Adaptations into Irish', in *Celtica* 16, 1984, pp.107-24, and by P.Mac Cana, 'La Traduction des Épopées Étrangères en Irlandais' in G.Contamine (ed.), *Traduction et Traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, Paris, 1989, pp.77-84, in which works the texts are more fully described, with the surveys being of a more critical nature, providing a good starting point for this survey; finally, J.Carney in 'Literature in Irish' in A.Cosgrove (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.704-7 provides a short list of the fifteenth-century translations, cited as examples of texts that brought Europe into Ireland.

At this stage, it is necessary to define more precisely what is meant by the Irish translation tradition of 'Matter' texts. If the sections on narrative in the principal Bibliography of Irish Philology are examined, the Irish 'Matter' translations come under the section of 'Classical and Medieval Translations and Adaptations'¹¹. The texts listed in these sections include texts which fall into the category of the three 'Matters'; however, they also include the travelogues of John Mandeville and Marco Polo, and a number of short stories which are based on 'Matter' subjects.

The travelogues cannot be described as having a fully literary character: they are descriptive accounts, and so they have been omitted from this particular survey¹². As for the short stories, they can not be considered to be direct translations, but adaptations of foreign sources and themes which the author has summarised, or woven into a new text¹³. The texts here considered are the 'Matter' translations¹⁴, either complete, abbreviated or embellished, which were written at any time up to the start of the sixteenth century, with the primary focus on the period after the year 1100. Where a short adaptation is mentioned in the survey, its purpose is to elucidate a parallel between the traditions of France and Ireland.

The translations of 'Matter' texts form a significant part of the corpus of Irish secular narrative prose literature which is known to have been composed in the later Middle Ages. The total number of new narrative texts falling into this category from this

¹¹R.I.Best, *Bibliography of Irish Philology and of Printed Irish Literature*, Dublin, 1913, pp.123-6; R.I.Best, *Bibliography of Irish Philology and Manuscript Literature, Publications 1913-1941*, Dublin, 1942, pp.90-1; R.Baumgarten, *Bibliography of Irish Linguistics and Literature, 1942-1971*, Dublin, 1986, pp.377-80.

¹²The travelogues will be considered in Chapter 3.

¹³This distinction is made by W.B.Stanford, 'Towards a history of classical influences in Ireland', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 70 C, 1970, pp.13-91. Also, it is difficult to date many of these adaptations precisely, as they are most often preserved in post-medieval manuscripts.

¹⁴The term 'translation' is a difficult one to define precisely. Broadly speaking, a translation is a text that preserves all the information of its source text or texts in a way that it is obvious what the source material is. The translation may be verbatim, abbreviated or embellished, but contains all the main information of the source text. If the translation uses two or more sources, it will be clear which sections of the translation have come from which source. Texts which use one episode from a text and develop this into a complete story, or texts that reduce a story dramatically in size can not be considered to be translations, but adaptations of source material.

period is not vast¹⁵. The manuscripts of the period, which date almost exclusively from after the mid-fourteenth century¹⁶, reveal that the scribes were more concerned with the copying of earlier medieval Irish texts, a possible parallel to the French pattern of producing prose romances¹⁷, along with the copying of translated medical and religious texts, and with the storing of texts containing useful ecclesiastical information¹⁸. The emphases are on the obtaining of new practical information and the preservation of the old lore.

The historical distribution of extant manuscripts highlights one of the problems in the study of Irish literature over the whole period of the later Middle Ages. Apart from three codices written during the twelfth century¹⁹, there are no other extant manuscripts containing Irish narrative material which date from before the time of the Black Death of the mid-fourteenth century. There is only one copy of a 'Matter' translation in a twelfth-century manuscript; all the remaining medieval evidence for Irish translations of 'Matter' texts comes from the time of the 'Gaelic Revival'²⁰, a process which commenced after the socio-economic upheavals of the mid-fourteenth century. Consequently, it is very difficult to infer much from manuscript evidence about the history of any translation activity that may have been occurring in the earlier centuries of the period in question; other forms of evidence, especially linguistic, need to be considered when considering the development of the 'Matter' tradition.

¹⁵Mac Airt in B. Ó Cuív (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.121, describes how Irish prose gained a significant number of new writers only in the seventeenth century; p.127, notes the lack in Irish of original texts of a philosophical or romantic prose nature (unlike in French).

¹⁶General discussion of manuscripts by F.Henry and G.Marsh-Micheli, 'Manuscripts and Illuminations' in A.Cosgrove (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.781-815.

¹⁷Mac Airt in B. Ó Cuív (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.127-128. Notes the copying of Middle Irish heroic tales, with little original prose composition. The demand was for poetic compositions.

¹⁸F. Shaw, S.J., 'Irish Medical Men and Philosophers' in B. Ó Cuív (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.87-101.

¹⁹The Book of Leinster, Lebor na hUidre and MS. Rawlinson B. 502.

²⁰Outlined by Simms in R.F.Foster (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.88-96.

Of the Irish 'Matter' translations, the largest, and earliest, group are those which belong to the 'Matter of Rome'. The majority of the translations have direct Latin sources, and the tradition seems to have blossomed in the twelfth century, around the time of the start of Norman interest in Ireland²¹. The two 'Matter of France' translations, essentially the Irish Charlemagne texts, also have direct Latin sources, and take second place in date to the 'Matter of Rome' texts, dating from around the year 1400, during the early phases of the Gaelic Revival. The last group of translations are the fifteenth-century 'Matter of Britain' texts, which can be divided into two sub-groups; Arthurian and English. There is only one extant translation of an Arthurian romance, and two of English romances. These translations all have English sources, all of which are themselves translations from French originals.

The following survey aims to list of all the Irish 'Matter' translations by identifying the sources and the dates of translation, in order to suggest, with reference to the important literary developments in France, how the Irish translations may reflect the French tradition. This survey will go through each 'Matter' in turn, outlining in the first instance the French scholastic and literary background to each 'Matter'. The survey will then illustrate how the 'Matters' were presented in later medieval Ireland. Most importantly for the purposes of this thesis, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, the here-edited Latin source of *Sdair Fortibrais*, one of the 'Matter of France' translations, which lies uniquely at the mid-point between the French and Irish literary traditions, can be examined with reference to the other proximate sources of French texts that were also translated into Irish, and can be considered within the general flow of literary ideas from France to Ireland in the later Middle Ages.

It may be asked how it is possible to acknowledge the existence of such a flow when none of the Irish translations have direct French sources. The Latin sources could be

²¹id., pp.53-82

see as representing a more general transmission of texts through the institutions of learning, and the English sources a more important influence of England upon the Irish translation tradition. It must be remembered at this point that the study and composition of the Latin texts that lay behind the vernacular 'Matters' was centred on the intellectual institutions that were most prominent in Northern France, resulting in their sizeable impact on Old French literature; in addition, the English sources of Irish translations were themselves all based upon French originals. Most significantly for this thesis, *Gesta Karoli Magni* was itself a translated from a French poem. Consequently, the importance of France and French literary culture will become quite apparent.

One further important point needs clarification. It can be asked if the literary influences on Ireland from France were direct, or if they all came via the medium of England. However, the actual channels of influence are not the main topic under consideration²²; this survey is concerned with identifying how the Irish translation tradition represented certain literary developments that had their origin based in the French-speaking areas, which in the twelfth and thirteenth century included England as well as France. It will be seen that certain developments in English had a crucial role in shaping the Irish tradition of, in particular, the fifteenth century. Consequently, the position of England as intermediary between France and Ireland will be considered where specific English developments played an important role in the shaping of the Irish 'Matter' tradition.

²²In part due to a complete lack of evidence suggesting exactly how the texts were transmitted.

'Matter of Rome'²³

The 'Matter of Rome' in Old French is a series of translations dating from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which are derived from classical Latin texts concerning aspects of Greek and Roman history²⁴. Compared to the other two 'Matters', it is not as well represented in the Old French literary tradition. The opposite is true in Ireland where, in terms of the number of texts translated, it is considerably more fully represented than the other two 'Matters'.

The sources of the French 'Matter of Rome' texts are of two principal types; classical epic poems and late classical prose histories. The three epics employed as sources were those of Virgil, Statius and Lucan. These epics appear to have been read in the time of Charlemagne, as they are all listed in the library catalogue of York which is contained in a poem written by Alcuin²⁵. During the eleventh and twelfth century, they were being analysed in the cathedral schools, notably at Chartres and Orléans, as specimen texts for grammatical study and as exempla for Christian life²⁶. Latin histories, for example the prose works of Sallust and Suetonius, could supplement and justify the information provided in the epics. Of the histories, late classical prose accounts concerning the Fall of Troy and Alexander became particularly influential, and later medieval Latin authors, especially in the twelfth century, used them as sources for their own epic poems and histories on these subjects²⁷.

²³The arrival and spread of this 'Matter' has been considered by Stanford, *op.cit.*, and also W.B.Stanford, *Ireland and the Classical Tradition*, Dublin, 1976.

²⁴Newstead, *op.cit.*, in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.8, New York, 1987, pp.225-6.

²⁵S.Allott, *Alcuin of York - Life and Letters*, York, 1974, p.165, l.1552.

²⁶F.E.Cranz, 'Classical Literary Studies' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.3, New York, 1983, pp.433-4 notes how the study of classical texts revived during the eleventh century after the gains of the 'Carolingian Renaissance' had been lost. The twelfth century saw classical studies in the cathedral schools reach their peak; most notably, at Chartres, the classics were taught in conjunction with Platonist philosophy, most influentially by Bernard of Chartres. He also notes how classical studies at Orléans fell out of favour during the thirteenth century with the rise of the study of Aristotelian philosophy at the University of Paris.

²⁷A.G.Rigg, 'Latin Literature' in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.7, New York, 1986, p.365 notes the twelfth-century use of the Troy story by Geoffrey of Monmouth, and the Trojan epics by

The most important group of texts resulting from this translation of Latin texts into Old French were the twelfth-century verse romances known as the 'Romans d'antiquité'. These romances were derived directly from Latin sources, both epics and late classical prose histories: the *Roman de Troie*²⁸ is a considerably expanded, romanticised version by Benoit de Sainte-Maure, later official chronicler to Henry II, for Eleanor of Aquitaine, of the *Pseudo-Dares Phrygius* and *Pseudo-Dictys Cretensis*, the two principal late classical prose accounts of the fall of Troy; the *Roman d'Alixandre*²⁹ was translated from the Latin translation by Julius Valerius of the *Pseudo-Callisthenes* history of Alexander; the *Roman d'Éneas*³⁰ is from the *Aeneid* of Virgil; and the *Roman de Thèbes*³¹ is from the *Thebaid* of Statius.

Another group of Old French texts deriving from Latin sources concerning antiquity were the prose histories concerning Greece and Rome. Dating from the thirteenth century are three examples: the *Histoire Ancienne jusqu'à César*³², which draws a large part of its material from histories that cover the same periods and subjects as the aforementioned classical epics and histories; the *Faits des Romains*³³ which is a compilation of Roman history based principally on the works of Suetonius, Sallust

Simon Chèvre d'Or and Joseph of Exeter. Also noted are the Alexander prose history, the *Historia de Preliis* and the epics by Walter of Châtillon and Quilichinus of Spoleto.

²⁸ed. L.Constans, Société des Aniennes Textes Françaises, 6 vols., Paris, 1904-12. Date and source and dedication, L.-F.Flutre in 'Benoit de Sainte-Maure', *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, Paris, 1964, p.110. The role of Benoit at the Plantagenet court is also discussed.

²⁹ed. E.C.Armstrong et al., 6 vols., Princeton, 1937-55. Date and source, L.-F.Flutre in 'Roman d'Alexandre', *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, p.649. Note, the first part of this romance was originally composed in the early part of the twelfth century; it gradually grew in size as a result of additions and embellishment over the course of the century. This shows that romances such as this were not immutable, and could be developed by different authors.

³⁰ed. J.J.Salverda de Grave, Paris, 1925. Date and source, see G.Raynaud de Lage, 'Énéas' in *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, p.256.

³¹ed. L.Constans, Société des Aniennes Textes Françaises, 2 vols., Paris, 1890. For discussion of date and source, see G.Raynaud de Lage in 'Roman de Thèbes', *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, pp.658-9.

³²Unedited. Discussion by P.Meyer, 'Les Premières Compilations Françaises d'Histoire Ancienne', *Romania* 14, 1885, pp.36-75.

³³ed.L.-F.Flutre and K.Sneyders de Vogel, Paris and Groningen, 1938. Sources discussed by Meyer, *op.cit.*, pp.1-35, and by M.Bendena, *The Translations of Lucan and their Influence on French Medieval Literature*, Ph.D 1976, Wayne State University, pub. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor & London, 1976, p.36.

and Lucan; and the *Histoire de Julius César*³⁴ by Jehan de Tuim that was based solely upon the epic by Lucan, the *Pharsalia*. This last text was subsequently adapted into a verse roman d'antiquité by Jacos de Forêt, the *Roman de Jules César*³⁵, which shows how even histories were not immutable in form, but could be adapted and turned from prose into verse.

There is one further text that requires notice here: this is the translation of the *Roman de Troie* into Latin prose, in the same manner as *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The translation, entitled *Historia Destructionis Troiae*³⁶ was written by the Sicilian Guido delle Colonne in the late thirteenth century. The medium of Latin prose was able to provide the text with a sense of being a true account of the historical events, and not just a series of romantic episodes³⁷.

In the Irish tradition, there are six extant translations of 'Matter of Rome' texts. Five of these translations are written in the Middle Irish that is characteristic of texts written from the tenth to the twelfth century³⁸. These five translations are all based on Latin sources which, like the Old French 'Matter of Rome' texts, are of two kinds; late classical histories and the classical epic poems. Although the translations of the latter seem to date from the twelfth century, those of the former may be somewhat earlier. These earlier translations are discussed here, as they come form an integral part of the Irish 'Matter of Rome'; this becomes most apparent during the Gaelic Revival. The Irish translations themselves are more akin to the Old French histories than to the romans d'antiquité in the sense that are all written in prose and relate the factual

³⁴ed. F.Settegast, Halle, 1881. Source analysed by Bendena, *op.cit.*, pp.55-8.

³⁵ed. Bendena, *op.cit.*, pp.130-488. Relationship with Jehan de Tuim discussed pp.79-83.

³⁶ed. N.E.Griffin, Cambridge, Mass., 1936. Source discussed, p.xv. Date contained in colophon, p.276.

³⁷See R.M Lumiansky, 'Legends of Troy' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, p.115. States how Guido "claims to be presenting a hitherto undiscovered account" of the Troy story.

³⁸Although lack of manuscript evidence makes dating for the most part dependent on linguistic analysis.

events of the story of the source text without the vast embellishment that is characteristic of the romances³⁹.

Of all but one of these translations, the sources of the Irish texts were also used by the authors of the French 'Matter of Rome' texts⁴⁰, hinting at an obvious parallel between the two traditions. Five principal subjects are covered: the stories of Troy and Alexander, which are derived from the late classical histories, and the stories of Aeneas, Thebes and the Roman Civil War which are translated from the classical epics. As has been seen before, these subjects are the five most important subjects of the Old French 'Matter of Rome' tradition.

Only one of the texts is extant in a twelfth-century manuscript compilation, in this case the Book of Leinster⁴¹. The other texts are found in manuscripts dating from the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, showing a continued interest in copying 'Matter of Rome' texts in the Early Modern Irish period. Most of these manuscripts also tend to contain narrative and poetic texts from the corpus of secular Old Irish literature, including *Lebor Gabála* and tales of the Ulster Cycle⁴². They are less common in manuscripts which contain texts of a predominantly ecclesiastical nature. In general, however, the 'Matter of Rome' translations were not overly popular in the later medieval manuscript tradition, with two or three copies being the average number of medieval manuscript copies of each text.

³⁹As opposed to the romans d'antiquité that expand their source text by the addition of 'romantic' material.

⁴⁰There is no evidence as to the identity of any of the Irish translators. However, the translators must have had access to the same sources as the French translators, possibly in the schools of Northern France. In any case, the transmission of at least the classical epics seems to suggest the influence of the international monastic orders on Ireland.

⁴¹T.C.D. MS. H.2.18., one of three extant twelfth-century manuscripts containing substantially literary material, the others being *Lebor na h-Uidre* and Rawlinson B.502. See F.Henry & G.Marsh-Micheli in A.Cosgrove (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.789. For dating, see R.I.Best, O.Bergin & M.A.O'Brien, *The Book of Leinster* vol.1, Dublin, 1954, p.xvii.

⁴²The Book of Leinster is an excellent example of such a manuscript. See R.I.Best, O.Bergin & M.A.O'Brien, *op.cit.*, pp.1-56 for *Lebor Gabála*; and *The Book of Leinster* vol.2, pp.261-399 for *Táin Bó Cuailnge*; and *The Book of Leinster* vol.4, pp.1063-117 for *Togail Troí*.

*Togail Troí*⁴³

The text on the Destruction of Troy is a direct translation of the *Pseudo-Dares Phrygius*⁴⁴, one of the two principal sources of the *Roman de Troie* by Benoit de Saint-Maure. Like the French romance, the source has been embellished, although not nearly to such a great extent⁴⁵. This translation may date from as early the tenth century⁴⁶, which would render it considerably earlier than the *Roman de Troie*. The earliest version of *Togail Troí* is preserved in the twelfth-century portion of the Book of Leinster⁴⁷, showing that the original translation must have been made at some stage before the compilation of this manuscript. The Book of Ballymote, dated 1390⁴⁸, is the next datable manuscript to contain a copy of the text, showing its copying into a compendium of Irish literature during the early period of the Gaelic Revival⁴⁹.

*Sdair Alaxandair*⁵⁰

The majority of the Irish Alexander story, a parallel to the French *Roman d'Alixandre*, is directly derived from the chapters on Alexander contained within the *Historia*

⁴³ed.W.Stokes from Book of Leinster, Calcutta, 1881; also ed.W.Stokes from MS.H.2.17 in *Irische Texte Zweite Serie* 1, Leipzig, 1884, pp.3-62.

⁴⁴id., p.1.

⁴⁵Stanford, *op.cit.*, pp.74-5 discusses aspects of this embellishment, showing how the translation was given some established features of Irish style.

⁴⁶The linguistic evidence for a date is provided by G. Mac Eoin in 'Das Verbalssystem von *Togail Troí*' in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 28, 1960/61, pp.73-136, 149-223. On p.202 it is stated that the original translation is likely to have been done in the tenth century. Although the greatest impetus to the Troy story was Geoffrey of Monmouth's twelfth-century description of the origins of the Britons, it had been used previously to explain the origin of the Franks in the seventh-century Chronicle of Fredegar (see R. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, 'Troy story' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.12, New York, 1989, p.221); hence, a tenth-century date is by no means impossible. However, linguistic evidence by itself is by no means conclusive.

⁴⁷Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.2.

⁴⁸See *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy* fasc.13, 1934, pp.1610-55. The nature of the manuscript is discussed by Henry & Marsh-Micheli in A.Cosgrove (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.798-800. This manuscript, like the Book of Leinster, is also a major compilation of earlier Irish literature.

⁴⁹Note the discussion of this text by G.Dottin, 'La Légende de la Prise de Troie en Irlande' in *Revue Celtique* 41, 1924, pp.149-80.

⁵⁰ed.K.Meyer in *Irische Texte Zweite Serie* 2, Leipzig, 1887, pp.16-108. More recently edited as *Die irische Alexander sage* by E.Peters in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 30, 1967, pp.71-264.

Adversum Paganos by Orosius. Additional material is supplied from other sources, most notably the *Epistola ad Aristotelem*⁵¹. These sources were not employed by the French romancers. A date of the tenth century has also been suggested for this translation⁵², although there is no extant manuscript prior to the last part of the fourteenth century⁵³. Translations of both the named sources were also made into Old English⁵⁴; assuming a tenth-century date, the Irish translator was most likely following the English, rather than continental, tradition⁵⁵. The Book of Ballymote is the first datable manuscript to contain a copy of the text, where it is located near to *Togail Troí*.

*Imtheachta Aeniasa*⁵⁶

The Irish translation of the *Aeneid* of Virgil⁵⁷, also the source of the *Roman d'Éneas*, is a direct prose redaction of the epic, somewhat shorter in length than the Latin original. Books I to III of the epic have been re-ordered, so that the narrative flows in a completely chronological manner, giving it the appearance of a more historical text⁵⁸. The translation has been dated to the twelfth century⁵⁹, although the earliest manuscript containing the text is also the Book of Ballymote⁶⁰, where it is found

⁵¹id., p.8-15. Discussed by R.T.Meyer in 'The Sources of the Middle Irish *Alexander*', in *Modern Philology* 47, 1949, pp.1-7. Also discussed by G.Cary, *The Medieval Alexander*, Cambridge, 1956, pp.69-70.

⁵²R.T.Meyer, *op.cit.*, p.1. Peters, *op.cit.*, also suggests the possibility that this translation was done in the tenth century. Cary, *op.cit.*, p.69, mentions that the Book of Ballymote version of this translation may date to the eleventh century.

⁵³K.Meyer, *op.cit.*, pp.1-2.

⁵⁴The 'Old English Orosius' was one of the translations of Alfred the Great in the late ^{ninth} century. See A. Cameron, 'Anglo-Saxon Literature' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.1, New York, 1982, p.284. The Old English *Epistola ad Aristotelem* is mentioned by Cary, *op.cit.*, p.15.

⁵⁵H.L.C.Tristram, 'More Talk of Alexander' in *Celtica* 21, 1990, p.658 describes the translation as expert for the time, but notes how, in comparison with the Old English texts, it does not present a moral reading of the story.

⁵⁶ed. G.Calder, London, 1907.

⁵⁷id., p.xiv. The translation is discussed and related to native medieval Irish literary style by R.T.Meyer in 'The Middle-Irish Version of the *Aeneid*', *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 11, 1966, pp.97-108. Also by R.J.Rowland in 'Aeneas as a Hero in Twelfth-century Ireland', *Vergilius* 16, 1970, pp.29-32, and by Stanford, *op.cit.*, pp.81-3.

⁵⁸Calder, *op.cit.*, pp.2-42.

⁵⁹Meyer, *op.cit.*, p.97.

⁶⁰See note 48.

close to *Togail Troí* and *Sdair Alaxandair*. This compiling of texts concerning antiquity is decidedly reminiscent of the *Histoire Ancienne jusqu'à César*⁶¹.

*Togail na Tebe*⁶²

Like *Imtheachta Aeniasa*, this story of the Destruction of Thebes is a direct prose redaction of the *Thebaid* of Statius⁶³, the Latin epic which was also the source for the *Roman de Thèbes*. The text has also been dated to the twelfth century⁶⁴, but the first fragmentary copy of the text is preserved in a late fourteenth-century manuscript⁶⁵. The first complete copy is of a later date, preserved in MS. Egerton 1781, and was written in the area of Co. Cavan in the year 1487⁶⁶. This text was, however, not included as part of the historical compilation in the Book of Ballymote.

*In Cath Catharda*⁶⁷

The longest of all the Irish 'Matter of Rome' translations, this text is a close prose translation of the first seven books of the *Pharsalia* by Lucan⁶⁸, the text which also supplied the material for French histories of the Civil War between Pompey and Caesar. Although the translation also seems to have been made around the twelfth century⁶⁹, the only manuscript containing the complete text is of seventeenth-century date⁷⁰; this implying a lack of popularity for this text as an ancient history during the

⁶¹P.Meyer, *op.cit.*, pp.36-75.

⁶²ed. G.Calder, Cambridge, 1922.

⁶³*id.*, p.xix. Also discussed and related to Irish literary style by R.T.Meyer in 'The Middle-Irish Version of the *Thebaid* of Statius', *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters* 47, 1961, pp.687-99. Also by Stanford, *op.cit.*, pp.83-5.

⁶⁴Meyer, *op.cit.*, p.687.

⁶⁵Stanford, *op.cit.*, p.81.

⁶⁶Portion containing *Togail na Tebe* is preceded by a note giving date and place of writing; Calder, *op.cit.*, p.xxiii.

⁶⁷ed.W.Stokes, *Irische Texte Vierte Serie* 2, Leipzig, 1909.

⁶⁸*id.*, p.v. Discussed by R.T.Meyer, 'The Middle-Irish version of the *Pharsalia* of Lucan' in *Proceedings of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters* 44, 1958, pp.355-63.

⁶⁹*id.*, p.355.

⁷⁰Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.vi - a manuscript in the Franciscan library dated 1616.

fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. However, there are fragments of the text preserved in two fifteenth-century manuscripts⁷¹.

Although *Togail Troí* and *Sdair Alaxandair* may not have reflected any contemporary French tradition when they were first translated, their presence in the Book of Ballymote where, along with *Imtheachta Aeniasa*, they form a compilation of ancient history in the French manner, suggests that the Irish historians were aware of the contemporary trends in French historiography. The case for French influence is made stronger by considering the final element in the compilation: this is the very short adaptation of the *Odyssey* entitled *Merugud Uilix maic Leirtis*⁷², which forms an epilogue to *Togail Troí*.

Merugud Uilix mac Leirtis is considered on linguistic grounds to be early thirteenth century in date⁷³, although no direct source of the text has yet been identified⁷⁴. The location of this text in the manuscript is very significant, since a short account of the wanderings of Ulysses also makes up the final section of the *Roman de Troie*⁷⁵. It seems likely that the Irish Troy story was updated in the early thirteenth century by means of the addition of the Ulysses story in a similar manner to the contemporary French fashion. In this light, it is most appropriate that the translation of the *Aeneid* forms the final element in the compilation of ancient history⁷⁶: the reader of the Latin translation of the *Roman de Troie* is encouraged to refer to the *Aeneid* in order to learn about the voyages of Aeneas as well as those of Ulysses⁷⁷.

⁷¹ibid.

⁷²ed.R.T.Meyer, Dublin, 1958. Discussed by Stanford, *op.cit.*, pp.75-8.

⁷³Meyer, *op.cit.*, p.xiii.

⁷⁴id., p.xvi.

⁷⁵*Roman de Troie*, ed. L.Constans, Société des Aniennes Textes Françaises, vol.6, Paris, 1912, p.196: The source of the information concerning Ulysses is the *Pseudo-Dictys Cretensis*.

⁷⁶Note: a similar compilation of ancient history can be found in King's Inns MSS.12 & 13. However, *Sdair Alaxandair* is not present; it is replaced by *Tres Troí*, an account of the history of Troy up to the time of Marius. This text is placed in between *Togail Troí* and *Merugud Uilix maic Leirtis*. Information from Meyer, *op.cit.*, p.xi.

⁷⁷Griffin, *op.cit.*, p.252.

In common with all the Old French verse texts and histories, the earlier 'Matter of Rome' texts were adapted and reworked into the French prose romances of the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries⁷⁸. One of the most prolific patrons for this type of adaptation was the Duke of Burgundy, Philip 'the Good'⁷⁹. Two of the prose adaptations of 'Matter of Rome' stories made for the Duke Philip were translated into English by William Caxton as material for the purposes of printing⁸⁰. One of these English translations was subsequently translated into Irish.

*Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás*⁸¹

This translation is very faithful to its English source⁸², and must date from the later fifteenth century following the date of the publication of the source text. The English source was itself a close translation the *Recueil des Histoires de Troyes*, completed by Raoul Lefèvre in 1464⁸³. After this text's entry into the Burgundian ducal library, it was translated by William Caxton into English between 1471 and 1475; the translation was printed in stages between 1474 and 1476⁸⁴. The Irish translation is preserved in only one fifteenth-century manuscript⁸⁵, of which the section containing *Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás* must date from after 1474.

⁷⁸The 'Matter of Rome' prose adaptations are discussed by G.Doutrepont, *Les Mises en Prose des Épopées et des Romans Chevaleresques*, Geneva, 1969, Ch..2, pp.224-314.

⁷⁹id., Ch.5, pp.414-27. Also G.Doutrepont, *La Littérature à la Cour des Ducs de Bourgogne*, Paris, 1909, Ch.2, pp.120-86 discusses the importance of the 'Matter of Rome' to the dukes in the fifteenth century.

⁸⁰R.H.Wilson, 'Malory & Caxton' in A.E.Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of Writings in Middle English* vol.3, New Haven, 1972, pp.776-80 discusses these texts translated between 1471 and 1478 from prose adaptations of Raoul Lefèvre, dated 1460-4.

⁸¹ed. G.Quin, Irish Texts Society vol.38, Dublin, 1939.

⁸²Wilson in A.E.Hartung (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.777.

⁸³ibid.

⁸⁴ibid.

⁸⁵T.C.D. MS. H.2.7.

Summary

In the French tradition, there was a tendency to blur the distinction between the historiography and romance genres within the 'Matter of Rome', with the same sources providing material for both genres. The Latin sources had enabled a history of antiquity to be compiled in Old French. With the composition of a number of 'historical romances', the French-speaking nobility in France and England were able to see the feats of the conquering heroes of antiquity, including Alexander and Julius Caesar, presented in a manner that was not identical to the original Latin sources.

The Irish translators used the same subjects for their translations as the French historiographers and romancers, and derived their information from a similar corpus of Latin source material. Seemingly the Irish-speaking patrons of the period desired to possess the same knowledge of classical antiquity that was available through the Latin epics and histories which were being studied in the schools, and subsequently used as source material for the French 'Matter of Rome' histories and romances.

The two translations, *Togail Troí* and *Sdair Alaxandair*, which may predate the twelfth century were both translated from Latin prose material; this suggests that these translations were made to represent the core subjects of ancient history. There is nothing distinctively 'French' about these translations: indeed, the Alexander story is more reminiscent of the tradition in pre-Norman England. It is only after the classical epics had been translated, at roughly the same time as they were being studied in the cathedral schools and translated into French, that the parallels between the French and Irish traditions become fully apparent. The earlier Irish translations provided the foundations of a literary tradition to which the twelfth-century translations could be added, thus allowing the full corpus of the French 'Matter of France' to be represented in Ireland. To make this representation more complete, the Troy story was updated to

accommodate a feature which had come to form an integral part of the Troy story in Old French.

The evidence for this French influence becomes more apparent at the time of the Gaelic Revival: in the Book of Ballymote, three of the translations and a short adaptation had come to form a compilation of ancient history covering the period from Troy to the time of Alexander, in the manner of a French history of antiquity. They are given prominence alongside native Irish tales in this manuscript, one of the foremost compendia of Irish literature from the fourteenth century. That the other two translations are not part of this compilation suggests that the stories of Thebes and the Civil War either had independent transmission patterns, or else were not considered to be such interesting historical documents.

Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás provides an insight into the activities of the translators working in the late fifteenth century. By using a printed English source, the text reveals awareness on the part of an Irish translator of the tradition of printed prose romances in France and England that was developing during the later fifteenth century, and shows the selection of a text that had originally been commissioned by none other than the Duke of Burgundy.

'Matter of France'

The 'Matter of France' chiefly comprises a series of texts which concern the French in the earlier part of the Middle Ages, from Clovis up to the time of the First Crusade, centring on Charlemagne, who represents the high point in French national power⁸⁶. Despite its popularity in France, this 'Matter' is represented by only two translations in Irish, both of which have a later date than the principal 'Matter of Rome' translations.

⁸⁶Newstead, *op.cit.*, in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.8, New York, 1987, pp.224-5.

The 'Matter of France' has its foundations in the Latin historiographical tradition concerning the kings of France prior to the twelfth century. This historical material started to be written during the Merovingian period; the earliest major history was the sixth-century *Historia Regum Francorum* of Gregory of Tours⁸⁷. In the ninth century, the first histories of Charlemagne were written⁸⁸, starting with the *Vita Karoli Magni* by Einhard⁸⁹, a contemporary of Charlemagne himself. The tradition culminated in the twelfth century with the composition of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, a fictitious account in which Charlemagne frees Santiago de Compostella, and then the whole of Spain, from the yoke of the Saracens⁹⁰. It is this text which exemplifies the heroic ideal, with Charlemagne, the Roman emperor, as the unifier of France and champion of Christianity, and also provides a history for one of the most important centres of pilgrimage in the Middle Ages.

As with the 'Matter of Rome', the Latin tradition of the 'Matter of France' gave rise to some historical literature in French. The *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* was translated into French on eight occasions during the Old French period, including a thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman version, showing that the text was known in England as well as France⁹¹. In addition, material from this text and other historical works formed fruitful source material for the compilers of the *Grandes Chroniques de France*⁹².

⁸⁷ed.W.Arndt in *Gregori Turonensis Opera*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum 1, Hannover, 1885, pp.31-450.

⁸⁸Latin texts about Charlemagne listed in *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* 1, Brussels 1898-9, pp.238- 45 and *B.H.L. Novum Supplementum*, Brussels, 1986, pp.179-86.

⁸⁹ed.O.Holder Egger, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum 25, Hannover, 1911.

⁹⁰ed.C.Meredith Jones, Paris, 1936.

⁹¹L.J.Emanuel, *The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle: its Influence and Literary Significance with Special Reference to Medieval French Literature*, Ph D. 1978, Pennsylvania State University, pub. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor & London, 1980, pp.22-52 provides a discussion of all the French translations of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*.

⁹²id., pp.40-3. Text ed. J.Viard, Société de l'Histoire de France, 10 vol., Paris, 1920-38. For a brief history of the chronicle, see R.Bossuat in '*Chroniques de France (Les Grandes)*', *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, pp.193-4.

The most distinctive group of texts of the 'Matter of France' are Old French verse epics which developed alongside this Latin tradition. These 'Chansons de geste'⁹³, dating from throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, relate the heroic exploits of the French nobility of Merovingian and Carolingian times in their strive for national unity and their quest to destroy the powers of the non-Christian world, principally the Saracens. Charlemagne is the major figure in these epic poems - he is the symbol of French unity, the Roman Emperor and the ultimate champion of the Christian faith.

The chansons de geste appear to have been conceived with a pronounced political purpose. They were able to demonstrate that Capetian France was a direct descendant of the Roman Empire, and the centre of the Christian world, as it had been in the time of Charlemagne. As the title of Roman Emperor had passed to the Germans in 962, at a time when the Carolingian king of France was politically weak, the Capetian successors of the Carolingians sought to reunite France politically with a sense of national identity, in which France was an heir of Rome, and the French were in the vanguard of Christendom as the leading nation of the crusading movement⁹⁴.

The oldest extant chanson de geste is the *Chanson de Roland*, essentially a version of one of the episodes contained in the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, dating in its earliest version from the first half of the twelfth century⁹⁵. A number of different versions of this story have been preserved, which all display Charlemagne with the characteristics

⁹³A general description of this genre is given by D.Poiron in 'Chansons de Geste', *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, pp.164-8. Note here G.Paris, *Histoire Poétique de Charlemagne*, Paris, 1865, the first major study upon this topic.

⁹⁴The motives for the composition of these poems are discussed at length by J. Bédier, *Les Légendes Épiques, Recherches sur la Formation des Chansons de Gestes*, 4 vol., Paris, 1908-13. The use of the vernacular language as a political tool of the Capetians is touched on by K.D.Uitti, 'French Literature: to 1200' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 5, New York, 1985, pp.234-5.

⁹⁵ed.G.J.Brault, *The Song of Roland*, London, 1978. Information on the date of the poem is given in vol.1, pp.3-6.

listed above⁹⁶. Just after the time of the first crusade of 1098⁹⁷, these subjects were highly relevant to the audience of the day, which may explain the wide diffusion of this particular story.

Another subject which occupied the writers of the 'Matter of France' was the history of Charlemagne and the Relics of the Passion. The twelfth-century Latin account, *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus Clavum et Coronam Domini a Constantinopoli Aquisgrani Detulerit*⁹⁸ described the journey of Charlemagne to the East to obtain the Relics. The story of the Relics was adapted into a chanson de geste, the *Chanson de Fierabras*⁹⁹, which described how Charlemagne recovered the Relics of the Passion which had been stolen by the Saracens. This text gave rise to the Fierabras story, which became very influential during the thirteenth century at the time when Louis IX of France had obtained the Relics of the Passion and constructed the Sainte-Chapelle for their preservation¹⁰⁰.

During the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the chansons de geste became useful sources for the prose redactors of Old French verse¹⁰¹. Occasionally, prose redactions were joined together to form historical compilations (or Épopées) concerning the life of Charlemagne, the most impressive of which was the *Chroniques et Conquêtes de Charlemagne*, written for the Duke of Burgundy in 1458 by David Aubert¹⁰², which included both the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* and the

⁹⁶ed. R.Mortier, 10 vols., Paris, 1939-44.

⁹⁷The crusades themselves were the subject of a number of literary texts, including a cycle of chansons de geste. Discussed by C.Cahen in 'Croisades (Littérature des)', *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, pp.233-6.

⁹⁸ed.G.Rauschen in *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Geschichtskunde vol.7, 1890, pp.103-25. More recently edited by F.Castets as 'Iter Hierosolymitanum' in *Revue des Langues Romanes* 36, 1892, pp.417-74.

⁹⁹ed.M.A.Kræber & G.Servois, *Chanson de Fierabras. Parise la Duchesse*, Les Anciens Poètes de la France vol.4, Paris, 1860, pp.1-204.

¹⁰⁰L.Grodecki, *Sainte-Chapelle*, Paris, 1967, pp.12-4.

¹⁰¹See G.Doutrepont, *Les Mises en Prose des Épopées et des Romans Chevaleresques*, Geneva, 1969. A list of the prose redactions of the chansons de geste is given pp.5-7 and discussed more fully in Ch.1, pp.20-223.

¹⁰²ed.R.Guiette, 3.vols.,Brussels, 1940. Dedication to Philip the Good, see vol.2.1, p.16. Discussed by Doutrepont, *op.cit.*, Ch.1, pp.63-89.

Chanson de Fierabras. A compilation such as this could demonstrate the historical comparisons between Charlemagne and a contemporary duke¹⁰³.

It was during this period, which coincided with the Gaelic Revival, that two texts concerning Charlemagne and his wars against the Saracens were translated into Irish. However, it was not in French form that the 'Matter of France' texts reached the Irish translators; the sources concerned were both Latin texts. In one case, the source text was the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, which, as explained above, was a popular source with the French historians. The source of the other is *Gesta Karoli Magni*, the Latin translation of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. As stated in the introduction, this text appears to have been the work of an Irishman, as apart from the Irish translation, this version of the story does not occur anywhere else. It will be argued that this translation was made for the purpose of bringing the popular French story of the Relics of the Passion to the Irish audience in the medium deemed most appropriate for the relation of factual information¹⁰⁴, the same medium as the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*¹⁰⁵, at a time between the spread of the *Chanson de Fierabras* itself and the date of the earliest manuscript of *Sdair Fortibrais*¹⁰⁶.

No manuscript earlier than the *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum*, written in Co. Roscommon around 1437, contains a copy of a 'Matter of France' translation¹⁰⁷. However, unlike the 'Matter of Rome' translations, the 'Matter of France' texts are comparatively well represented in the manuscript tradition of the fifteenth century. These fifteenth-century manuscripts chiefly comprise texts of a Christian and medieval subject

¹⁰³ 'Matter of France' in Burgundy discussed along with 'Matter of Britain' by Doutrepont, *La Littérature à la Cour des Ducs de Bourgogne*, Paris, 1909, Ch.1, pp.1-119.

¹⁰⁴ Chapters 2-5 will consider *Gesta Karoli Magni* in greater depth.

¹⁰⁵ Both texts are written in a straightforward Latin prose.

¹⁰⁶ The dating of *Gesta Karoli Magni* will be considered in greater detail in Chapter Two, Section Two, and thereafter.

¹⁰⁷ R.I.A. MS. 23 O 48 contains the earliest copy of *Sdair Fortibrais*.

matter, including Biblical paraphrases and hagiographic texts¹⁰⁸. As the texts concern the wars between the Christian and Islamic worlds, and the retrieval of the Relics of the Passion and Spain for Christendom, it is the historical importance of the subject matter to the church that must account for a part of this relative popularity.

*Sdair Fortibrais*¹⁰⁹

The Irish version of the story of the Relics of the Passion is a close translation of *Gesta Karoli Magni*¹¹⁰, with only certain unnecessary details being omitted. The translation must have been made prior to 1437, the date of the *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum*, and it is written in plain Early Modern Irish¹¹¹. The translation is well represented in the manuscript tradition of the fifteenth and early sixteenth century¹¹². Every copy of *Sdair Fortibrais* is prefaced by a translation of *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*¹¹³, the story of the discovery of the True Cross by Helena, stressing the importance of the Relics of the Passion in the reading of the text.

*Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*¹¹⁴

Like *Sdair Fortibrais*, this text is a close translation of a Latin text, in this case the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*. Similarly, certain unnecessary details of the Latin original are omitted, showing how the priority of the translator was to relate the major facts of

¹⁰⁸Note here the late fifteenth-century Book of Lismore, in which one 'Matter of France' text is found along with a number of Saints' lives, a historical text concerning Charlemagne (*Sdair na Lumbardach*) and a copy of *Acallam na Senorach*. See the list of contents of the manuscript printed in W.Stokes, *Lives of the Saints from the Book of Lismore*, Oxford, 1890, pp.v-xliv.

¹⁰⁹ed.W.Stokes, *Revue Celtique* 19, 1898, pp.14-57, 118-67, 252-91, 364-93.

¹¹⁰See later, Chapter 4, section 1.

¹¹¹Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.14, describes it crudely as 'a fourteenth or fifteenth-century tale'.

¹¹²R.Flower, *A Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum* vol.2, London, 1926, p.527 lists most of the manuscripts - see Chapter 2 for fuller list.

¹¹³The short version of this text from the Leabhar Brecc (c.1400) has been edited by V.E.Hull in 'Two Middle-Irish Anecdotes', *Speculum* 3, 1928, pp.98-103.

¹¹⁴ed.D.Hyde, *Irish Texts Society* vol.19, London, 1917.

the story¹¹⁵. The linguistic style is again a plain Early Modern Irish, and a date around 1400 has been suggested for the translation¹¹⁶. This text is also well preserved in fifteenth-century manuscripts, showing the popularity of the story during this century¹¹⁷.

In two manuscripts datable to the last quarter of the fifteenth century, the Co. Offaly portion of manuscript Egerton 1781, dated 1484¹¹⁸, and also T.C.D. H.2.12. pt.3., dated 1475¹¹⁹, the two texts are found adjacent to each other. This relationship seems to follow that established in the literary tradition of Burgundy and Eastern France in the second half of the fifteenth century. David Aubert, in his *Chroniques et Conquêtes de Charlemagne* had adapted into prose the *Chanson de Fierabras* to form the opening of the second half of his compilation glorifying Charlemagne. A translation of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* followed, though not directly, to complete the history of Charlemagne in Spain¹²⁰. In 1478 the Savoyard writer Jean Bagnyon framed his prose adaptation of *Fierabras*¹²¹ with a prologue and an epilogue, the epilogue being a translation of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*. This work was subsequently translated into English as *Charles the Great* by Caxton, and published in 1484¹²².

It is quite apparent that some of the Irish manuscript compilers were using the same pattern as Bagnyon. The translation of *Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás* has already shown the influence between Ireland and the printed prose literature of Burgundy, although it

¹¹⁵ id., 8. "Cuid d'anmannaibh na cathrach do ghabh Serluis isin Spain leicim thoram iat ar deacracht na n-anmann mbarbardha do radh."!!

¹¹⁶ id., p.vi.

¹¹⁷ Flower, *op.cit.*, p.528.

¹¹⁸ id., p.526-7. The bulk of this manuscript was written in what is modern-day County Offaly in 1484. In 1487, after the manuscript had been taken to the area of County Cavan, a new section was inserted.

¹¹⁹ ibid. Hyde, *op.cit.*, p.x, also notices the two texts, but fails to identify the first text as a copy of *Sdair Fortibrais*, referring to it as *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*.

¹²⁰ See Guiette, *op.cit.*, vol. 2.1.

¹²¹ Doutrepoint, *Les Mises en Prose des Épopées et des Romans Chevaleresques*, Geneva, 1969, Ch.1, pp.94-6.

¹²² See Wilson in A.E.Hartung (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.792-3.

must be remembered that in this case, the inspiration for the Irish translation came directly from the English text printed by Caxton. It is not unreasonable to suggest that the juxtaposition of the two 'Matter of France' texts was also influenced the preparation and printing of *Charles the Great*. However, the dates in the manuscripts are unable to support this. Indeed, it could be stated that the inspiration might just as well have come directly from the publishing of Bagnyon's text.

At this stage, it is worth making a point of nomenclature: although the editor of the Irish translation of the Fierabras story entitled it *Sdair Fortibrais*¹²³, a number of the manuscripts give it the title *Sdair Serluis Mhóir*. Thus, in manuscripts where the two 'Matter of France' texts appear together, their title would be *Sdair ocus Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*, which is a direct translation of *Chroniques et Conquêtes de Charlemagne*. This suggests that there may have been some familiarity with the ideas presented in the compilation of David Aubert. It is possible that the Irish 'compilation' is a parallel to that of Bagnyon, with both traditions juxtaposing the two texts used by Aubert that best describe Charlemagne's Spanish campaigns. It is impossible to ascertain in what manner the ideas of Aubert could have reached Ireland; however, it is possible to suggest some influence of the Burgundian ducal library upon the literary tastes in contemporary Ireland, as in England.

Summary

The 'Matter of France', centring on stories about a golden age of French history, was able to furnish the Capetian kings with suitable material on which to construct a French national pseudo-history. The themes and subjects of the texts are distinctly French, and relevant to the French of the Middle Ages. This aspect distinguishes the 'Matter of France' from the 'Matter of Rome', the latter having a considerably wider

¹²³ W. Stokes, *op.cit.*, p. 16.

importance to nations outside France. However, the 'Matter' also concerned subjects of importance to Christendom as a whole, with the subjects that developed in the thirteenth century like the transfer of the Relics of the Passion to France being of wider interest.

In this light, the lack of a sizeable 'Matter of France' tradition in Irish is not surprising. To the Irish patrons of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the 'Matter of Rome' was more appropriate than the 'Matter of France'. The French were able to set the 'Matter of France' beside the 'Matter of Rome' to show the exploits of the heroes of Christian France in relation to those of the heroes of antiquity. Therefore, to the Irish patrons, the tales of Irish warriors, most notably the Fenian tales¹²⁴, were more appropriate to be set alongside 'Matter of Rome' texts.

When the 'Matter of France' does appear, the theme of the freeing of Christian Relics and holy places from the Saracens is the important feature of the texts chosen for translation. The Irish translators joined together two Latin texts to provide a factual history of just a short period in the life of Charlemagne. There is no attempt to provide a complete history of the period. In this respect, the Irish tradition does not parallel the French - the French texts are considerably more numerous, prose redactions forming compilations which could champion Charlemagne, and, by implication, France. The Irish patrons did not require this representation of French nationalism. They wanted to possess the history of the retrieval of the Relics and Spain from the Saracens in a written form. Within this history, the French are the crucial agents of Christendom who succeed in these aims.

¹²⁴Note *Acallam na Senorach* which preserves twelfth and thirteenth-century linguistic forms; see edition by W.Stokes, *Irische Texte, Vierte Serie 1*, Leipzig, 1900 who notes these linguistic forms pp.xiii-xiv. Also G.Murphy, *The Ossianic lore and Romantic Tales of Medieval Ireland*, Dublin, 1955, which discusses the rise of the Fenian tales.

'Matter of Britain'

As with the 'Matter of France', the 'Matter of Britain' achieved widespread popularity¹²⁵. The inspiration for the genre came from Britain in the twelfth century, although thirteenth-century France saw the composition of the largest number of texts. However despite the widespread popularity of this 'Matter' among French readers, there are very few Irish translations, with none dating from before the fifteenth century. As with the 'Matter of France', the subjects would seem to have been of less interest to a Irish audience.

The original inspiration for the Arthurian romances, which form the major component of the 'Matter of Britain', came from the section on Arthur in the *Historia Regum Britanniae* by Geoffrey of Monmouth¹²⁶. The *Historia Regum Britanniae* was written during the 1130's¹²⁷ to relate the history of the early British kings following the destruction of Troy up to and including Saxon times. The political and ideological value of this text was recognised by Henry II of England, and it was quickly translated into French verse by Wace as the *Roman de Brut*¹²⁸, for which it came to serve as part of a compiled history of Britain. The *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie*, commissioned by Henry II from Benoit de Sainte-Maure¹²⁹, formed the final part of this history.

¹²⁵Newstead, *op.cit.*, in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.8, New York, 1987, pp.223-4. A good general overview is given by R.S.Loomis, *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1959.

¹²⁶ed.A.Briscom, New York, 1929. Section on Arthur runs pp.426-501. For discussion on this material as the source of the Arthurian legend, see H.Newstead, 'Arthurian Legends' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.39-42.

¹²⁷Briscom, *op.cit.*, p.42, states that the *Historia* was first published in 1136.

¹²⁸ed. I.Arnold, 2 vols., Société des Aniennes Textes Françaises, Paris, 1938-40. Discussed by E.Francis in 'Wace', *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, p.759, and R.S.Loomis, *op.cit.*, pp.94-103 where the patronage of Wace by Henry II is noted.

¹²⁹ed.F.Michel, Paris, 1836-44. See R.Boussat, *Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age*, Melun, 1951, p.350, where the commission of Henry II is noted. Hence, the *Roman de Troie*, dedicated to Eleanor of Aquitaine, could have been read as an extended introduction to the *Roman de Brut* and the *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie*.

These texts stories gained popularity with twelfth-century French authors of verse narrative, in particular those with a British interest. Two notable examples are Marie de France, who composed her series of *Lais*¹³⁰ in England for one 'Henry'¹³¹, and Thomas, who wrote the story of *Tristan*¹³² at the court of Henry II¹³³. However, the most influential group of French Arthurian verse romances composed in the last quarter of the twelfth century were those of Chrétien de Troyes, who worked under for some time under the patronage of Marie de Champagne, the daughter of Eleanor of Aquitaine, then wife of Henry II¹³⁴. His first romance, *Erec et Enide* contains distinct reference to the territories of the 'Angevin Empire' of Henry II¹³⁵, as well as displaying the ideals of chivalry to which a knight should aspire. The four other romances *Cligés*¹³⁶, *Lancelot*¹³⁷, *Yvain*¹³⁸ and *Perceval*¹³⁹, all portrayed the same characteristics in their respective knights.

In thirteenth and early fourteenth-century France, one particular subject, the Holy Grail, became very influential¹⁴⁰. This subject had been brought to prominence by Chrétien in *Perceval*. However, this romance was left unfinished by Chrétien himself. Four verse continuations of this story were composed¹⁴¹, showing the popularity of the Holy Grail as a Christian subject. The prose Grail text *Perlesvaus*¹⁴² was

¹³⁰ ed. J. Lods, *Classiques Français du Moyen Age* vol. 87, Paris, 1959.

¹³¹ R. S. Loomis, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-7.

¹³² ed. B. Wind, Geneva, 1960.

¹³³ R. S. Loomis, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

¹³⁴ *id.*, p. 158. Eleanor married Henry in 1152, before the active period of Chrétien de Troyes. The life of Marie de Champagne is outlined by G. S. Burgess, 'Marie de Champagne' in J. R. Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol. 8, New York, 1987, p. 135.

¹³⁵ ed. C. W. Carroll, New York and London, 1987. See 1.6600-4, where all of the areas in which Henry II had influence (prior to his marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine) are mentioned, viz. Normandy, Brittany, Scotland, Ireland, England, Cornwall, Wales, Anjou, Maine, Poitou.

¹³⁶ ed. W. Foerster, Amsterdam, 1965.

¹³⁷ ed. W. W. Kibler, New York and London, 1984. *Lancelot* appears to have been dedicated to Eleanor herself and is thought to have been composed between 1177 and 1181.

¹³⁸ ed. W. W. Kibler, New York and London, 1985.

¹³⁹ ed. K. Busby, Tübingen, 1993.

¹⁴⁰ Unsurprising as the Holy Grail was a Relic of the Passion similar to those brought to Paris by Louis IX, for which the *Chanson de Fierabras* provided a fictitious literary account.

¹⁴¹ One, ed. M. Williams, Paris, 1922-5. Three, ed. W. Roach, Philadelphia, 1949-83. These are discussed in R. S. Loomis, *op. cit.*, pp. 206-17.

¹⁴² ed. W. A. Nitze, Chicago, 1932-7. Discussed by R. S. Loomis, *op. cit.*, pp. 263-73.

composed with both *Perceval* and *Lancelot* supplying source material. The Grail story was also the inspiration for the thirteenth-century prose text *La Queste del Saint Graal*, an account leading to the eventual discovery of the Relic. This prose adaptation was added to the prose *Lancelot*, a vast compilation of the exploits of Lancelot based on the original romance of Chrétien, and also two further adaptations of stories concerning the Grail, *L'Estoire del Saint Graal* and *L'Estoire de Merlin*¹⁴³. This compilation has come to be known as the Vulgate Cycle, a cycle of tales which are based around the history of and quest for the Grail¹⁴⁴.

In addition to the Arthurian texts, another group of romances which may be included with the 'Matter of Britain' are the romances which concern English heroes¹⁴⁵, such as *Gui de Warewic*¹⁴⁶ and *Boeue de Hamtun*¹⁴⁷. Originally composed in Anglo-Norman, these romances were designed to show the nobility of early English (as opposed to Arthurian British) knights, and would have had the significance of locale for their readers in England. In common with the chansons de geste of the 'Matter of France'; the English heroes have to defeat foes including, as in the two texts named above, the Saracens in order to achieve their ultimate goals.

In the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, some of the twelfth-century verse 'Matter of Britain' texts were redacted into prose¹⁴⁸, as with the other 'Matters'. However, this period did not witness the composition of new vast prose romantic histories of the Arthurian knights, so characteristic of the thirteenth century.

¹⁴³ Both these texts were adapted from works of Robert de Borron, who was inspired by the romances of Chrétien de Troyes to write texts which explained the early history of the Grail. See Newstead in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.73.

¹⁴⁴ The complete Vulgate Cycle is edited by H.O.Sommer, 7 vols., Washington, 1909-13. R.S.Loomis, *op.cit.*, pp.295-318.

¹⁴⁵ The inclusion of these texts is taking a small liberty with the definition of 'Matter of Britain'. However, it seems pertinent to include them along with Arthurian tales as both concern British subjects with the translations being made from English sources.

¹⁴⁶ ed.A.Ewert, Paris, 1933.

¹⁴⁷ ed. A.Stimming, Bibliotheca Normantica vol.7, Halle, 1899.

¹⁴⁸ Adaptations of poems discussed by G.Doutrepont, *Les Mises en Proses des Épopées et des Romans Chevaleresques*, Geneva, 1969, Ch.2, pp.224-314. For 'Matter of Britain' in Burgundy, see Doutrepont, *La Littérature Française à la Cour des Ducs de Bourgogne*, Paris, 1909, Ch.1, pp.1-119.

Three 'Matter of Britain' texts were translated into Irish during the fifteenth century. There is only one example of an translation of an Arthurian text to consider, and two 'English' texts which occur adjacently in only one manuscript and hence may be considered together. The principal distinguishing feature between these texts and those of the other two 'Matters' is that they appear to have been translated from English originals, illustrating further the role of England in the fifteenth century as an intermediary between the French and Irish traditions.

The English sources also suggest a secular channel of transmission, which is perhaps supported by the fact that unlike the 'Matter of France', these texts are preserved in comparatively few manuscripts from the fifteenth century. There is no firm evidence to suggest exactly when these translations were being made, but if the other two 'Matters' are considered, the direct influence of English texts can only be observed later in the fifteenth century, during the period in which Ireland was relatively stable, the royal government being controlled by Anglo-Irish magnates, most notably the Earls of Kildare¹⁴⁹. It can be asked if the 'Matter of Britain' translations were made as material of interest to the ruling Anglo-Irish magnates of the fifteenth century. Indeed, the library of the Earls of Kildare contained a number English romances and Irish texts¹⁵⁰.

*Lorgaireacht an tSoidhigh Naomhtha*¹⁵¹

This text, the only example of a translation of an Arthurian text into Irish, presents the Grail to the Irish audience. It shows the continued importance of the Relics of the

¹⁴⁹ K. Simms in R.F. Foster (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.96. Although the support by Kildare of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck against the Tudors shows a lack of faith in the new royal house, serious political difficulties only erupted in Ireland after 1534.

¹⁵⁰ The catalogue of the library of the Earl of Kildare in MS. Harley 3756 (see S.H.O'Grady, *A Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum* vol.1, London, 1926, pp.154) contains items in Latin, French, English and Irish. A. Bliss and J. Long, 'Literature in Norman French and English' in A. Cosgrove (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.736 note how romances such as Troy, Thebes, Charlemagne and Arthur predominate in the English list of texts.

¹⁵¹ ed. S. Falconer, Dublin, 1953.

Passion as a subject, even if this particular Relic was not one preserved in the Sainte-Chapelle¹⁵². It is considered by its editor to be translated from a lost English version of the *Queste del Saint Graal*, since the only extant English translation of this text by Thomas Malory, is too short to be the source text¹⁵³. The text is found in three fifteenth-century manuscripts,¹⁵⁴ and is thought to be no earlier than mid-fifteenth century¹⁵⁵.

*Guy de Bharbhuic/ Bibhuis de Hamtun*¹⁵⁶

The Irish translations of these two romances concerning English heroes are found in only one fifteenth-century manuscript¹⁵⁷, indicating that they did not enjoy quite the same popularity as the Grail text. They too appear to have been translated into Early Modern Irish during the fifteenth century from English originals¹⁵⁸, themselves translations of the Old French romances *Gui de Warewic* and *Boeue de Hamtun*. The Irish version *Bibhuis* is fragmentary¹⁵⁹, whereas *Guy* is complete. An added passage in *Bibhus*, in which the hero spends a year on Rhodes, suggests that the translation was made for the benefit of the Anglo-Irish, as the Irish Knights Hospitaller (who

¹⁵²This translation has been set into the wider sphere of Arthur in the Irish literary tradition by W.Gillies, 'Arthur in Gaelic Tradition. Part 2: Romances and Learned Lore' in *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 3, 1982, pp.41-75, in which it is concluded that Arthurian literature was a relatively late arrival in Ireland, becoming more established in the post-medieval period.

¹⁵³Falconer, *op.cit.*, p.xix; Gillies, *op.cit.*, pp.57-8 suggests that the *Morte Darthur* of Malory was known in Ireland as a potential historical source. The position of Malory will be discussed more fully in the next section of this chapter.

¹⁵⁴Falconer, *op.cit.*, pp.xxxiii-vii.

¹⁵⁵*id.*, p.xxxii.

¹⁵⁶ed.F.N.Robinson in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 6, 1908, pp.9-180, 273-338.

¹⁵⁷*id.*, p.9. MS. T.C.D. H.2.7, which also contains *Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás* and an appended copy of *Sdair Fortibrais*. Quin, *op.cit.*, p.xl notes that the scribe of this manuscript was Uilliam Mac an Leagha, and suggests that he may have been the translator of these texts (not including *Sdair Fortibrais*).

¹⁵⁸Robinson, *op.cit.*, p.10 - notes similarity between texts and *Sdair Fortibrais*.

¹⁵⁹There has been a recent, detailed study of *Bibhuis de Hamton* made by E.Poppe in 'The Early Modern Irish Version of *Beves of Hamtoun*', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 23, 1992, pp.77-98, in which it is discussed how the translation was written in such a way to be relevant to the Irish audience. It is noted how the scribe of the manuscript, Uilliam Mac an Leagha, may also have been the translator, whom the Butlers of Ormond appear to have patronised.

ruled Rhodes) tended to be of Anglo-Irish stock¹⁶⁰. The subject matter of both these translations demonstrates the chivalric ideals of the French romances better than the texts of the other two 'Matters', which have more of a historical tone. However they continue to exploit the theme of the Christian knight fighting with enemies including the Saracens¹⁶¹.

Summary

In the twelfth century, the 'Matter of Britain' covered a number of subjects, ranging from history of the Kings of England through Arthurian romance and Breton lais to accounts of English heroes. It covered a golden age of British history, a parallel to the 'Matter of France', although the British stories were more relevant to the 'romantic' interests and ideals of the twelfth century than the 'Matter of France' which was relevant to more 'pragmatic' concerns. However, the situation had changed by the thirteenth century, when a sizeable body of literature concerning the Holy Grail developed. This is cognate with the development of stories about the other Relics of the Passion in the thirteenth-century 'Matter of France'.

Bearing in mind the popularity of this 'Matter' elsewhere, the scant representation of this 'Matter' in Ireland is perhaps surprising. As with the 'Matter of France', the lack of Irish 'Matter of Britain' texts in twelfth and thirteenth-century Irish tradition can be attributed to native Irish tales, such as those of the Fenian Cycle, providing a suitable volume of romantic as well as pragmatic material. However, the texts that were translated from English in the fifteenth century show that the 'Matter of Britain' had attracted the attention of certain Irish translators.

¹⁶⁰id., pp.97-8, with full references. This idea supports the idea that the author had an Anglo-Irish patron.

¹⁶¹Both Guy and Bevis are continually struggling with adversaries on their quests for recognition and marriage.

The stories chosen for translation contain the same subjects as the 'Matter of France' translations. The Arthurian tradition provided useful information about the Holy Grail, one of the most important Relics of the Passion. The stories of the English heroes Guy and Bevis related the exploits about their struggles against the pagans that was suitable for an Anglo-Irish audience, even if the stories did not necessarily have the same historical importance as those of the 'Matter of France'¹⁶². But although it was felt necessary to have a token representation of this 'Matter' in Irish translation of the later fifteenth century. However, only the bare essentials crossed the language frontier in the form of translations.

Résumé

Although this description is skeletal, it provides a starting point for the study of the Irish 'Matter' translations, primarily from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. The description has demonstrated the general scope of the three 'Matters' and explained briefly why these subjects were popular in French literature. The first part of the period witnesses the vernacularisation of Latin accounts of past heroes, giving rise to verse romances whose prime function was to express the values of chivalry and courtly love, and epics designed to justify the French position at the centre of the Roman world. Latterly, the medium of prose becomes more prominent, texts being rewritten in a more factual style to appeal to a wider audience, in particular after the socio-economic changes of the fourteenth century.

Although there are several points of comparison, the representation of the three 'Matters' in Ireland show differing patterns to what holds for France. The 'Matter of

¹⁶² i.e. these texts are not concerned a mainstream event in Christian history like the conflict between Charlemagne himself and Saracens. The chivalry of individual knights is most important to the 'Matter of Britain'. Also, the most important Christian symbol of the 'Matter of Britain', the Holy Grail, does not have the same historical significance as the True Cross or the Crown of Thorns, as it is not a Relic that was extant or preserved in the Sainte-Chapelle.

Rome' is relatively strongly represented: the five historical topics which formed the basis for the twelfth-century romans d'antiquité all generated Irish translations by the twelfth century, deriving information from a very similar set of source texts. This process indicates a desire to transmit knowledge of the ancient world, known to the French and the Normans, and studied in the schools like Chartres and Orléans, to the Irish audience. As Christians, it was clearly appropriate for the Gaelic Irish to be as aware of the classical inheritance as the French-speaking aristocracy of France and Norman England. By the late fourteenth century, the history of antiquity from Troy to Alexander, the first subjects of classical history translated into Irish, could be found in a small compilation in the manuscript tradition.

The 'Matter of France' only started to gain popularity at the end of the fourteenth century when two important texts, which concern the wars of Charlemagne with the Saracens in Spain in order to regain land and the Relics of the Passion for Christendom, were translated into Irish. These two Irish translations were made from Latin prose accounts, one of which, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, had exported the French story to the Irish market. These translations, which represent only a small number of 'Matter of France' texts available in French, were carefully selected to discuss the subjects that were of greatest interest to the Christian community. The Latin prose sources presented the stories in the most acceptable medium for the relating of such accounts. As the works contained important historical information, these translations have been preserved in a relatively large number of manuscripts.

The 'Matter of Britain' is represented by one Arthurian Grail text, and two English romances. All are translated from English originals, suggesting a date later in the fifteenth century for their translation when relations between Ireland and England were less strained. The 'Matter of Britain' served to augment the information gained from the 'Matter of France'. The story of the Holy Grail added to the base of

knowledge about the Relics of the Passion, and the English romances shed some extra light on the Christian conflict with the Saracens. However, as the subjects were not as important as their peers from the 'Matter of France', there was no large-scale translation of 'Matter of Britain' texts in the fifteenth century, and those that were translated are not preserved in a large number of extant manuscripts.

The influence of English was also felt by the other two 'Matters'. A further 'Matter of Rome' translation is of late fifteenth-century date, and is taken from an English edition made by Caxton of a Burgundian prose redaction of the Troy story. In addition, during the last quarter of the fifteenth century, the two 'Matter of France' translations were copied together into the manuscripts to form a continuous narrative of the wars of Charlemagne in Spain. This followed the same pattern used established by a French redactor, whose work was made known to an English audience by a Caxton edition. These show an influence on Ireland of the contemporary Burgundian literary trends towards the end of the fifteenth century; the increasing availability of English printed texts being one clear way in which this influence was exerted.

The above section has given a description of the Irish translations of the three 'Matters', and has gone some way to explaining why particular texts were chosen for translation. However, it has not shown if the texts chosen by the Irish translators were chosen by them alone, or if they were following patterns of translation that had been established in nearby areas where different languages were spoken and written; for it has just been reiterated how English printed texts exerted an influence of their own over the Irish translation tradition. It now needs to be asked if the Irish translation tradition represents that of England in other respects, or indeed if it represents the translation tradition of other literatures. Further insight into this question will be gained by an examination of the translations made into English, Welsh and Old Norse, the neighbouring literary cultures to Ireland during the later Middle Ages.

SECTION TWO**THE 'MATTER' TRANSLATIONS IN ENGLISH,
WELSH AND OLD NORSE**

Translations of 'Matter' texts were not only made into Irish during the later Middle Ages. A number of 'Matter' texts were also translated into the other principal vernacular languages that were being spoken in the British Isles, that is English, Welsh and Old Norse (specifically Norwegian, represented in Man and the Isles), in this period. However, unlike the Irish tradition, these other languages gained a number of translations from French and Anglo-Norman originals in addition to the Latin sources. These texts must be discussed in order to see if the selection of texts that were translated into Irish is a unique selection, or if it is representative of a corpus of texts which were being translated during the same period all over the British Isles.

As has already been noted in the previous section, the spread of English printed texts that seems to have provided an influence on the Irish translations in the later fifteenth century. The English vernacular tradition is of some importance when considering the Irish tradition, and this survey will elucidate how, in addition, the English material provides certain useful comparanda, especially from the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, that show parallels with the Irish translations. However, the Irish tradition does not just mirror the English vernacular translations: the chronological distribution of texts, and the sources, often differ.

The Welsh and Norse translations, chiefly of the thirteenth century, barely show any similarities with the Irish translations. Although a brief list of the Welsh and Norse texts would suffice to demonstrate the lack of obvious parallels, the description presented here is able to show the other translation traditions at work which, although unlike the Irish tradition, illustrate how patterns of translation differed between later

medieval Ireland, Britain and Norway. Thus the Irish translations can be viewed in the cultural context of the British Isles during the later Middle Ages.

English¹

In terms of numbers, the texts translated into English are considerably more numerous than those of any other language. The earliest translations of 'Matter' texts into English are dated to the thirteenth century, but these are few in number, since French was the language of the Anglo-Norman aristocracy during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The main bulk of the translations into English date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries². Unlike the Irish translations, the majority of English translations take the form of verse romances, some of which were redacted into prose later in the fifteenth century³.

'Matter of Rome'⁴

Three of the five subjects of Old French 'Matter of Rome' are represented in English literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; There is no extant English version of the *Aeneid* prior to the year 1513, and the *Pharsalia* is absent. The texts themselves are extant in two forms: verse romances, and prose adaptations of these verse romances⁵. The verse romances are of fourteenth and fifteenth-century date, and, unlike the Irish 'Matter of Rome' translations which have classical Latin source texts,

¹The information concerning English translations is for the most part taken from J.Burke Severs (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* Fasc.1: Romances, New Haven, 1967.

²See the complete list of Middle English Romances by H.Newstead in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.13-6. All romances including translations from 1225-1533 are listed, with the largest group dating from the late fourteenth century.

³*id.*, p.15 - some later fifteenth-century romances, notably those by Malory and Caxton, were written directly in prose.

⁴Described and discussed by R.M.Lumiansky in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.104-19.

⁵Note that the subjects of ancient history as demonstrated by the source texts of the Old French and Irish translations were not well represented in Middle English chronicles. See E.D.Kennedy in A E Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* vol 8: 'Chronicles and Other Historical Writing', New Haven, 1989. Ancient histories are not listed in any form in this volume.

tend to be verse romances based upon texts based on French texts, or, in one case, a Latin translation of a French text. These sources suggest that the English 'Matter of Rome' texts should be considered alongside the Middle French prose adaptations of Old French texts, and not as versions akin to the translations of classical epics and histories.

Concerning Troy, there are six extant translations, five in verse and one in prose, dating from fourteenth and fifteenth centuries⁶. The most popular source for the verse translations was the *Historia Destructionis Troiae*, the Latin prose translation, finished in 1287 by Guido delle Colonne, of the French verse *Roman de Troie*⁷. One such romance, the *Troy Book* of Lydgate⁸, was written between 1412 and 1420 at the request of Henry, later Henry V of England⁹, showing continued royal interest in the Troy story at the English court in the fifteenth century¹⁰. This tradition is unlike that of Ireland, where the translation of the *Pseudo-Dares Phrygius* occurred at a much earlier date. However, it must be noted that the Irish *Togail Troí* continued to be copied in Ireland during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, showing that interest in the story was not extinguished during these years.

The one Troy translation not derived from the *Historia Destructionis Troiae* is the prose translation made by Caxton around 1475 of the *Recueil des Histoires de Troyes* of the Burgundian romancer Raoul Lefèvre¹¹. This English translation was, of course, the original of the Irish *Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás*, illustrating the influence of an English printed prose text over the Irish tradition.

⁶R.M.Lumiansky, 'Legends of Troy' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.114-8. Bibliography, *id.*, pp.274-7.

⁷*id.*, p.115.

⁸ed.H.Bergen, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.97,103,106,126, London, 1906-35.

⁹See A.Renoir & C.D.Benson, 'John Lydgate' in A.E.Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* vol.6, New Haven, 1980, p.1913.

¹⁰Noting the earlier *Roman de Troie* composed by Benoît de Sainte Maure, the French chronicler of Henry II.

¹¹Discussed by R.H.Wilson, 'Malory & Caxton' in A.E.Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* Vol.3, New Haven, 1972, p.777.

There are six extant translations concerning Alexander, five in verse, one in prose, also dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries¹². All these romances are indirectly derived from the *Pseudo-Callisthenes* tradition. Some are derived from the *Historia de Preliis*, the Latin translation of the *Pseudo-Callisthenes*.¹³ Others have French sources, in particular the Middle French romances *Voeux du Paon*¹⁴ and *Fuerre de Gadres*¹⁵ which were composed as additional material for the earlier *Roman d'Alixandre*¹⁶. This tradition is unlike that of Ireland, where at an earlier date the history of Orosius, as opposed to the *Pseudo-Callisthenes* tradition, supplied much of the source material for the Alexander story. However, as with *Togail Troí*, *Sdair Alaxandair* continued to be copied in Irish from the late fourteenth century, showing a maintained degree of interest.

Of Thebes¹⁷, there was one verse romance written by Lydgate¹⁸, which is assumed to have been derived from an unidentified French source¹⁹. Although there is extant a short mid-fifteenth-century redaction of the work of Lydgate²⁰, Thebes appears to have been a less popular subject in Middle English literature than Troy or Alexander. The same was true of Ireland, where the only complete copy of the text dates from the late fifteenth century. However, the text of Lydgate is of later date than the Irish *Togail na Tebe*, and is not translated from a classical epic source.

¹²Lumiansky, 'Legends of Alexander the Great' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.104-13. Bibliography, id., pp.268-73.

¹³id., p.104. The *Pseudo-Callisthenes* biography of Alexander, translated in to Latin first by Julius Valerius, c.300. A.D. and second by Leo, Archpresbyter of Naples, c.950 A.D..

¹⁴ed.R.L.G.Ritchie in *The Buick of Alexander by John Barbour* vols 2-4, Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh & London, 1921.

¹⁵ed.E.C.Armstrong & A.Foulet, *The Medieval French "Roman d'Alexandre"* vol.4, Princeton, 1942.

¹⁶Lumiansky in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.105.

¹⁷R.M.Lumiansky, 'Legends of Thebes' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.119. Bibliography, id., p.277.

¹⁸ed.A.Erdmann & E.Ekwall, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.108, London, 1911.

¹⁹Renoir & Benson, *op.cit.*, pp.1901-4.

²⁰ed.F.Brie in 'Zwei Mittelenglische Prosaromane: The *Sege of Thebes* and the *Sege of Troy*', *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* vol.130.40, pp.269ff. See also Lumiansky in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.119.

The only translation of the *Aeneid* into English was made into Scots verse by Gavin Douglas²¹. Entitled *Eneados*²², the translation was completed in the year 1513, thus falling right at the end of the period under consideration here. It is unique in being the first classical epic to be translated as a heroic epic, as opposed to being turned into a romance²³. This unique feature, coupled with the late date and the Scottish authorship suggests that this translation could be considered as antecedent to the Renaissance, rather than a tailpiece to the medieval English 'Matter of Rome'.

Crudely speaking, the English 'Matter of Rome' translations tend to date from after the Black Death and after the decline of French as the language of the English aristocracy²⁴. The English romances for the most part develop from the French tradition, using French, or French-derived texts, as source material. This source material used for the English romances was generally not derived from classical epics²⁵, of which there is very little representation in English before the sixteenth century. The Irish translations conversely are more akin to the French 'Matter of Rome', dating from earlier centuries, and using classical epics in addition to late classical Latin histories as direct source texts. It is noticeable that for a long period the English romance tradition continued to develop, while no new translations were made into Irish. Only when an English prose Trojan text was available in print did an Irish translator see fit to expand the corpus of the Irish 'Matter of Rome'.

²¹F.H.Ridley, 'Middle Scots Writers' in A.E.Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* vol.4, New Haven, 1973, pp.992-1001.

²²ed.D.F.C.Coldwell, Scottish Text Society, 3rd. Series, vols.25,27-8,30, Edinburgh & London, 1957-64.

²³Ridley in A.E Hartung (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.1001.

²⁴A process quickened by the war with France, and the socio-economic changes of the fourteenth century.

²⁵in effect, this means that the vast majority of the romances concern Troy and Alexander, the two 'Matter of Rome' subjects about which stories were first translated into Irish, albeit and a considerably earlier date than their conversion into the English romance tradition.



'Matter of France'²⁶

The 'Matter of France' translation tradition in Middle English is again principally one of verse romance. As in the Irish 'Matter of France' texts, it is the destruction of Saracen power in Europe by Charlemagne that is the principal subject of this 'Matter' in English. Like the English 'Matter of Rome' texts, the extant romances date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, also the period of the French prose adaptations and of the Irish translations.

There are two principal groups of 'Matter of France' romances, the 'Otuel' group and the 'Firumbras' group²⁷. Both of these groups contain romances based upon the chansons de geste *Chanson d'Otinel*²⁸ and *Chanson de Fierabras*. Thus, the English romances represent an element which is not present in the Irish translations, the Otinel story. They do, however, show that the Fierabras story was being translated in England at the same time as in Ireland.

The 'Otuel' group appears to be somewhat earlier in date than the 'Firumbras' group. There are three fourteenth-century verse romances, all derived from the *Chanson d'Otinel*²⁹. Two of the romances appear to date from the early fourteenth century; one of them has an appended romance based on the *Redacted Johannis Turpin*³⁰, a thirteenth-century French prose translation of the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*³¹. Prior to the late fifteenth century, this appendage is the only representation of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* in Middle

²⁶From Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.80-100.

²⁷*id.*, p.81 for these groups.

²⁸ed.F.Guessard & H.Michelant in '*Gui de Bourgogne, Otinel*', *Anciens Poètes de la France* vol.1, Paris, 1859.

²⁹Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.87-94. Bibliography, *id.*, pp. 262-5. The date of these romances would appear to be somewhat earlier than the 'Matter of France' translations in Ireland.

³⁰ed.R.N.Walpole, U. California, 1976.

³¹*id.*, p.88.

English, it may be surmised that this historical text did not appeal to the romantic tastes of the day.

The romances of the 'Fierabras' group are of a later date; they are all derived from a version of the *Chanson de Fierabras*³². The three extant verse romances are dated between the third quarter of the fourteenth century and the first half fifteenth century, a very similar date to the Irish 'Matter of France' translations. These dates illustrate that the Fierabras story and the Relics of the Passion were interesting the English and Irish translators around the year 1400, but in a different way; the English were looking to compose romance from a *chanson de geste* whereas the Irish were seeking historical knowledge from Latin prose texts.

In addition to the verse 'Fierabras' texts, there is a printed prose translation made in 1485 by Caxton of the *Fierabras* of the Savoyard Jehan Bagnyon, a French adaptation which was first published in 1478³³. This text also includes material from the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, material which came via the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais³⁴. As a text read in Burgundian circles, Bagnyon's text is part of the same tradition of French prose adaptations that had witnessed Lefèvre writing the *Recueil des Histoires de Troyes*. Although the translation of the *Fierabras* by Caxton did not lead to a new Irish translation, it has been noted previously how *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* are copied adjacently into manuscripts of the later fifteenth century.

Certain other independent 'Matter of France' translations are extant. One, derived from the *Chanson de Roland*, dates from around 1400³⁵. However, it was the advent

³²id., pp.81-7. Bibliography, id., pp.259-62.

³³id., p.86.

³⁴id., p.87; *Speculum Historiale* ed.Erlangen,1893.

³⁵Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.94-6; ed.S.J.Herrtage, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.35, London, 1880.

of the printing press widened the market and demand for translations at the end of the fifteenth century. Along with the translation of *Fierabras*, Caxton also published a translation of the *Quatre Fils Aymon* in 1489³⁶. The last translation was made by Lord Berners of *Huon de Bordeaux*, published 1534 by Wynkyn de Worde³⁷.

The three groups of 'Matter of France' in England form traditions of three different periods: 'Otuel', 'Firumbras' and texts translated for printing. The *Chanson d'Otinél* appears to have been a popular source text for romances written in the fourteenth century. However, it was superseded towards the fifteenth century by the *Chanson de Fierabras* on account of its interest in the Relics of the Passion. The popularity of this story remained into the age of printing, so that it became the first 'Matter of France' story to be printed in English.

The major difference between the two stories is that the Otinel story does not refer to the movement of the Relics of the Passion to Paris. Although not a very 'romantic' subject in itself, this major piece of information concerning the most important of all Christian relics can be presumed to have been a major factor in the composition of the English 'Firumbras' texts. However, both the Otinel and Fierabras stories could provide fruitful source material for verse romances. The Irish translator was dealing with Latin prose histories, suggesting that the historical facts were the major points of interest in the text, which is why the Fierabras story, and not that of Otinel, was taken to Ireland as well as the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*..

³⁶Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.98; ed.O.Richardson, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.44-5, London, 1884-5. See the discussion of the compilation of David Aubert in Chapter Two, Section Two for the position of *Quatre Fils Aymon* between the *Chanson de Fierabras* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*.

³⁷Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.98-100; ed.S.Lee, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols 40,41, 43, 50, London, 1882-7.

'Matter of Britain'³⁸

As in French, the 'Matter of Britain' in Middle English comprises romances concerning both England and the Arthurian tradition. The number of extant romances, in particular Arthurian romances, is large. However, many of the romances are original compositions: a not unlikely development, given that the subject matter is directly relevant to the English-speaking countries³⁹. Unlike the other two 'Matters', the 'Matter of Britain' romances in English date from the beginning of the thirteenth century and proceed right up to the end of the Middle Ages, showing that there was a market for vernacular material even before the decline of French as the language of the aristocracy. Of course, a sizeable number of the early romances are translations from French, particularly Anglo-Norman, texts.

The largest number of thirteenth-century translations concern England, suggesting a growing English-reading audience receptive to tales of English heroes in quests against foes such as the Saracens. In the fourteenth century, the number of Arthurian romances produced increases rapidly, presumably in response to the foundation of the Order of the Garter by Edward III in 1348⁴⁰. However, few of these romances are translated from French or Latin sources.

There are five extant translations concerning England, four of which are in verse; they are for the most part of comparatively early date. There is also one later prose translation. Of the three verse texts which contain specifically English subjects, all three are translated from Anglo-Norman sources. One, *King Horn*⁴¹, was translated

³⁸Most information taken from C.W.Dunn, 'Romances Derived from English Legends' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp.17-37, and H.Newstead, 'Arthurian Legends' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.38-79.

³⁹Compare to the original French chansons de geste and the Irish Fenian tales.

⁴⁰This order used the Knights of the Round Table as their primary models. See H.Nickel, 'Chivalry, Orders of.' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.3, 1983, pp.301-3.

⁴¹ed.J.R.Lumby, Early English Text Society vol.14, London, 1866 (re-ed. G.H.McKnight, London, 1901).

around 1225⁴². The two others, *Guy of Warwick*⁴³ and *Bevis of Hampton*⁴⁴ were translated around 1300⁴⁵.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth century, interest in these romances continued; English modernisations of *King Horn*⁴⁶ and *Guy of Warwick*⁴⁷ are extant. It is the proliferation of these versions which led to *Guy of Warwick* and *Bevis of Hampton* being translated into Irish. In addition, an English prose translation of an earlier fifteenth-century French prose version of the Horn story was printed by de Worde⁴⁸.

The thirteenth century also witnessed the earliest translation of a text making reference to Arthur. This text is the *Brut* of Laȝamon⁴⁹, a translation dated to around 1200 of the twelfth-century *Roman de Brut* of Wace⁵⁰, which was itself a translation of the *Historia Regum Britanniae*. This text was important to the English audience as a work which related the early history of the kingdom. This historical information from the *Historia Regum Britanniae* continued to be adopted by chroniclers in the fourteenth and fifteenth century⁵¹.

The vast bulk of the English Arthurian romances that draw their basic inspiration from French Arthurian romances belong to the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. However, two of the closest Arthurian translations date from around the year 1300⁵², contemporary with some of the English translations mentioned above. These are the

⁴²Dunn in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.18.

⁴³ed.J.Zupitza, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.42,49,59, London, 1883-91.

⁴⁴ed.E.Kölbing, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols. 46,48,65, London, 1885-94.

⁴⁵Dunn in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.25-9.

⁴⁶*id.*, pp.20-2.

⁴⁷*id.*, p.28.

⁴⁸*id.*, p.22.

⁴⁹ed.G.L.Brook & R.F.Leslie, Early English Text Society, vols.250 & 277, London, 1963 & 1978.

⁵⁰Newstead in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.42-4; E.D.Kennedy, *op.cit.*, pp.2611-7.

⁵¹*id.*, pp.2617-47 for the chronicles which drew material from the *Historia Regum Britanniae*. Also Newstead in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.44-6 for texts solely concerned with the life of Arthur based upon the *Roman de Brut*.

⁵²See list by Newstead in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.13.

translations of *Yvain*⁵³, and also the *Tristan* of Thomas⁵⁴. The influence of Chrétien de Troyes and his contemporaries is noticeable among the sources identified.

As in France, it is the legacy of Chrétien de Troyes, in particular the stories of the Holy Grail, that left the greatest mark, despite there being few direct translations. Although there are no direct translations of these texts, the first continuation of *Perceval* supplied material on Gawain in relation to the Grail story⁵⁵, and the second continuation of *Perceval* furnished the romancers with material on Perceval himself⁵⁶. The two main Grail translations are taken from the *Estoire del Saint Graal*⁵⁷, the prologue to the Vulgate Cycle. In like manner, the Vulgate *Merlin*, part of whose author's purpose may have been to bridge the gap in Grail history between Joseph of Arimathea and Arthur, became a source for romances whose setting coincided with the early history of the Grail⁵⁸.

Although romances concerning Lancelot were derived from the *Prose Lancelot* and the *Mort Artu* of the Vulgate Cycle⁵⁹, there is no English translation of the *Queste del Saint Graal* (the ultimate source of the Irish Grail text) until it appears in *Le Morte Darthur* of Malory, dated 1469-70⁶⁰. In addition to using the *Queste del Saint Graal*, Malory also extracted material from the *Prose Lancelot* and *Mort Artu*, the prose *Tristan* and a text which included material from the Vulgate *Merlin*⁶¹ as source material. The result was a compilation about the Arthurian knights and the Grail

⁵³*Yvain and Gawain*, ed. G.Schleich, Leipzig, 1887.

⁵⁴*Sir Tristrem*, ed. G.P.McNeill, Scottish Text Society vol.8, Edinburgh 1886.

⁵⁵Newstead in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.54-5, 62, 67, 70.

⁵⁶*id.*, p.70.

⁵⁷*id.*, pp.72-4.

⁵⁸*id.*, pp.47-8

⁵⁹*id.*, pp.50-2.

⁶⁰ed.J.Cowen, 2 vols., Baltimore, 1969.

⁶¹See R.H.Wilson in A.E.Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* vol.3, New Haven, 1972, pp.757-67.

based upon themes and subjects already current in England, including coincidentally the ultimate source for the Irish translation. This was the Arthurian text which Caxton chose to publish in 1485⁶², and which de Worde reprinted in 1498⁶³.

In English literature, as in French literature, the 'Matter of Britain' formed the backbone of the romance genre. Naturally, there were local differences: in thirteenth-century English texts, English heroes predominate; in the fourteenth century and later, Arthur regains the central role, in the period following the foundation of the Order of the Knights of the Round Table.

The scatter of the surviving English 'Matter of Britain' texts differs from that of Ireland, where the texts are all of fifteenth-century date. Notably, the Arthurian portion of the 'Matter of Britain' is only represented by a Grail text, suggesting that if the Irish-speaking patrons were, like the English, interested in the Relics, they had little use for expanding this literature which portrayed heroes around whom an English Order of Chivalry was based. Bearing in mind that the fifteenth-century Irish translations are translated from English sources, it seems likely that the 'Matter of Britain' in Ireland was following to a limited extent the fifteenth-century developments in England of the English and Grail subjects; the printed editions of prose texts by Caxton and de Worde may have provided some inspiration for the Irish translations.

⁶²id., p.912.

⁶³id., p.760.

By the time of the compilation of the two principal manuscripts of narrative Welsh prose, the 'White Book of Rhydderch', c.1350,⁶⁵ and the 'Red Book of Hergest', c.1400⁶⁶, a number of 'Matter' texts had been translated into Welsh, all three 'Matters' being represented to some extent⁶⁷. The number of texts translated is not as great as the number translated into English. Comparison of the extant texts reveals two striking differences between the Welsh and English traditions. First, it appears that most of the Welsh translations date from the thirteenth century, at a time when the Princes of Wales were still independent from England. Second, they are all written in prose form, following the example set by the writers of the thirteenth-century French histories and Vulgate romances. This early use of the prose medium is akin to the Irish 'Matter of Rome' translations.

'Matter of Rome'

The 'Matter of Rome' is represented only by a translation of *Pseudo-Dares Phrygius*, *Ystoria Dared*⁶⁸, of which the earliest copy is early fourteenth century⁶⁹. This shows that the text which inspired the Irish translation had also influenced the Welsh writers in a similar period. However, unlike *Togail Troí*, *Ystoria Dared* is invariably found prefacing a translation of the *Historia Regum Britanniae*, entitled *Brut y Brenhinedd* in the manuscripts. This juxtaposition interestingly shows how this account of the Destruction of Troy formed the historical introduction to the History of Britain in

⁶⁴The list of translations into Welsh is given by D.S.Evans, *A Grammar of Middle Welsh*, Dublin, 1964, pp.xxxi & xxxiv-v.

⁶⁵M.Stephens, *The Oxford Companion to the Literature of Wales*, Oxford, 1986, p.637.

⁶⁶*id.*, p.506.

⁶⁷The transfer of certain 'Matter' texts, in particular the 'Matter of France', into Wales has been previously discussed by M.Watkin in 'The French Literary Influence in Mediaeval Wales' in *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorian*, 1919-20, pp.1-81.

⁶⁸ed. J.Rhys & J.G.Evans, *The Text of the Bruts from the Red Book of Hergest*, Oxford, 1890, pp.1-39.

⁶⁹D.S.Evans, *op.cit.*, p.xxxiv.

Welsh. In Ireland, by contrast, the Troy story was an element in the corpus of the texts concerning ancient history, as has been shown previously.

'Matter of France'

Around the year 1300⁷⁰, four texts of the 'Matter of France' were translated and joined together to form a compendious history of Charlemagne, *Ystorya Carolo Magno*⁷¹, demonstrating his military prowess against the Saracens, and his winning of land and relics for Christendom⁷². These texts were the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*⁷³, the *Chanson de Roland* and the *Chanson d'Otinél*. The *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* and the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* provide a historical frame for the middle text, in this case the *Chanson d'Otinél*.

The appearance of the Otinel story in a Welsh source of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries is reminiscent of its popularity in English sources of the same period. Indeed, the whole compilation is reminiscent of the English 'Otuel' romance that includes material from the *Redacted Johannis Turpin*. The inclusion of the *Chanson d'Otinél* implies a date no later than the early fourteenth century for the compilation: in later European compilations, the *Chanson de Fierabras* was generally employed, due to the growing importance of the Relics of the Passion. In the Welsh compilation, the story of Charlemagne obtaining the Relics of the Passion is taken from the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, which, as will be discussed in the next

⁷⁰id., p.xxxi.

⁷¹ed.S.J.Williams, Cardiff, 1930. This compilation is discussed by A.C.Rejhon in *Cân Rolant: the Medieval Welsh Version of the Song of Roland*, U. of California Publications in Modern Philology vol.113, ~~Serkeley~~ Berkeley, 1983, which also provides a modern, critical edition of the translation of the *Chanson de Roland*.

⁷²Watkin, *op.cit.*, pp.76-8, concludes that the 'Matter of France' translations are works advocating the crusades occurring from the twelfth to the fourteenth century.

⁷³Note: as will be discussed in Chapter Two, section one, this text is a parody that explores the concept of rivalry between two groups of Christians. In the context of thirteenth-century Wales, this could be seen as alluding to the Edwardian conquest of the principality.

chapter⁷⁴, does not present the story in the heroic manner of the *Chanson de Fierabras*.

The 'Matter of France' is slightly better represented in Welsh than in Irish, but there are two important differences to note: first, the use of Otinel story, as opposed to that of Fierabras, underlines the earlier date of Welsh translations; second, the Welsh translations were translated directly from French into Welsh, whereas the extant Irish texts have Latin originals. It has been suggested that the Irish translators turned to the Latin tradition because they were looking for history rather than romance. However, the compilatory nature of *Ystorya Carolo Magno* indicates that the person who commissioned that work also desired a historical treatment of the exploits of Charlemagne, and considered sources in French to be as acceptable as sources in Latin for his historical purposes.

'Matter of Britain'

A Welsh version of the *Historia Regum Britanniae* was made around 1200⁷⁵. Unlike the contemporary English version of La3amon, it was made directly from the Latin text. The translation, *Brut y Brenhinedd*⁷⁶, became popular, and is preserved in around sixty manuscripts⁷⁷.

As previously mentioned, this translation is often prefaced by *Ystorya Dared*, which expands the section opening section on the Destruction of Troy. The linking of these two texts follows the pattern observed earlier in the Middle Ages in French, whereby the *Roman de Troie* forms part of a trilogy with Wace's *Roman de Brut* and the *Chroniques des Ducs de Normandie*, which collectively served as an account of the

⁷⁴See Chapter Two, Section One.

⁷⁵D.S.Evans, *op.cit.*, p.xxxiv.

⁷⁶J.Rhys & J.G.Evans, *op.cit.*, pp.40-256.

⁷⁷D.S.Evans, *op.cit.*, p.xxxiv.

history of the British kings from the fall of Troy. What happens in Welsh may be compared with this, where *Ystoria Dared* and *Brut y Brenhinedd* are placed before the *Brut y Tywysogion*⁷⁸, the history of the Princes of Wales down to the end of their independence in 1282⁷⁹.

Assuming the Princes of Wales had commissioned the *Brut y Tywysogion* to be made, their intention must surely have been to show how their royal line enjoyed a direct descent from Troy, and thus shared the same early British history as the Kings of England. Thus could their rule in Wales be justified. On this assumption, the extinction of the line of Princes of Wales gives us an approximate terminus ante-quem of 1282, and makes it reasonable to assume that these translations took place during the thirteenth century, following the work of Benoit de Sainte-Maure and Wace, at approximately the same time as the work of Laȝamon.

In addition to the 'historical' texts, some 'Matter of Britain' romances were translated into Welsh, in which Arthur and the Grail were considerably more important than the English subjects⁸⁰. Potentially the earliest, and certainly the most debated, are the 'Three Romances' which form part of the collection known as the 'Mabinogion'. These three texts, *Geraint*⁸¹, *Owein*⁸² and *Peredur*⁸³, the earliest copy of the first of which dates from the late thirteenth century⁸⁴, follow the same story-lines as the Chrétien de Troyes romances *Erec*, *Yvain* and *Perceval*. There has been much dispute as to whether these texts are translations of the romances of Chrétien, or translations of lost Anglo-Norman originals, or native Welsh tales which were adapted by Chrétien⁸⁵.

⁷⁸ed.T.Jones, Cardiff, 1955 - the version of *Brut y Tywysogion* in the Red Book of Hergest.

⁷⁹M.Stephens, *op.cit.*, p.59.

⁸⁰The Arthurian literature of Wales is considered in R.S.Loomis, *Wales and the Arthurian Tradition*, Cardif, 1956.

⁸¹ed.J.Rhys & J.G.Evans, *The Text of the Mabinogion and Other Welsh Tales from the Red Book of Hergest*, Oxford, 1887, pp.244-95.

⁸²ed.R.L.Thomson, Dublin, 1968.

⁸³ed.G.W.Goetinck, Cardiff, 1976.

⁸⁴D.S.Evans, *op.cit.*, p.xxx.

⁸⁵Summary by M.Stephens, *op.cit.*, p.570.

It seems more likely that the Welsh texts are translations of French romances. For one thing, there are no examples of early Welsh texts being translated into French (even if French Arthurian texts are based ultimately on British stories), whereas there are a number of Welsh translations of French texts. Discrepancies between the Welsh and French texts prevent us from saying whether the romances of Chrétien were themselves the sources. It can be argued that the romances of Chrétien have an integrity and entirety that precludes their being derived from the Welsh texts. It can also be stated that there is no evidence for any Anglo-Norman originals.

Chrétien himself had connections with the English court via his patron Marie de Champagne, and that his romances could easily have reached Wales. There is no concrete evidence to clinch this argument, but, also bearing in mind the translation of *Yvain* into English c.1300, it remains the most obvious option⁸⁶. A thirteenth-century date would thus seem reasonable for the translations, some time between the composition of the French romances and the first appearance of the translations in an extant manuscript. It is interesting that *Peredur*, a presumed translation of *Perceval*, shows the first indication of interest in the Holy Grail in Wales at this time⁸⁷.

The other representation of the Grail in Welsh is in the very long text entitled *Y Seint Graal*⁸⁸, which is a Grail text combining two French Grail texts⁸⁹, *La Queste del Saint Graal* and *Perlesvaus*⁹⁰. As these texts were not completed until the middle of

⁸⁶This is not the place to enter a full discussion on this topic. It is more important to note the relationship between the French and Welsh texts, and realise that this represents an earlier tradition not found in Ireland.

⁸⁷This text has been examined in detail by G.W.Goetinck, *Peredur, a Study of Welsh Tradition in the Grail Legends*, Cardiff, 1975.

⁸⁸ed.R.Williams, London, 1876.

⁸⁹D.S.Evans, *op.cit.*, p.xxxi.

⁹⁰ed.W.A.Nitze, 2 vols., Chicago, 1932-7.

the thirteenth century⁹¹, the Welsh 'translation' could have been made anytime between their completion and the earliest manuscript, which dates from the late fourteenth century. The length of this text is reminiscent of the long continuations of *Perceval* and of the prose Vulgate Cycle in French. It shows the growing interest in the Grail in fourteenth-century Wales, and also illustrates an early use of the text which was the ultimate source of the Irish Grail text. However, the Welsh text did not inspire the Irish translation.

The English part of the 'Matter of Britain' is represented only by *Ystorya Bown de Hamtwn*⁹², a translation of the Anglo-Norman *Boeuve de Hamton*⁹³. Unlike the Irish version, this Welsh translation was made from the original Anglo-Norman poem. The earliest manuscript can be dated to the late thirteenth century, the period when the English translation was being made⁹⁴.

In Welsh, as in English, the Grail occupies an important place in the 'Matter of Britain' translations. It is better represented in Welsh: not surprisingly, on account of the British associations. While the Grail is not the only subject to be treated, the significance of the Grail clearly made its mark in Wales at an early stage. The translation of the 'Matter of Britain' texts took place directly into Welsh from the twelfth and thirteenth-century French texts: there was no use of English intermediaries.

⁹¹M. de Riquer in 'Graal', *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - Le Moyen Age*, Paris, 1964, p.331.

⁹²ed.M.Watkin, Cardiff, 1958.

⁹³ed.A.Stimming, Halle, 1899.

⁹⁴D.S.Evans, *op.cit.*, p.xxxi.

Translations of texts of the three 'Matters' are also represented in the Norse, specifically Norwegian, literature of the thirteenth century⁹⁶. The translations are part of the 'Riddarasögur' genre, which comprises tales of knights and chivalry, like the French and English romances. As well as the Norwegian translations of the thirteenth century, the original Icelandic romances of the two succeeding centuries are also included in this genre⁹⁷. The thirteenth-century translations are written in prose and derive much of their source material from French texts. In these respects, they are similar to the Welsh translations discussed above.

It may be asked why these Norwegian translations should be considered as comparanda to the Irish, English and Welsh translations. The answer in part is that Old Norse, as spoken in Norway and Iceland, was a vernacular language represented in the Scottish Islands at least until 1266 when the Hebrides ceased to be subject to the Norwegian Crown⁹⁸, following the death of King Hákon IV. However, the more important reason is that Hákon and his immediate successors are personally identified as the patrons who commissioned a number of the translations from a similar group of French and Latin texts as, in particular, the Welsh patrons up to the start of the fourteenth century⁹⁹. As the King of Norway had British interests, it may have been

⁹⁵The basis for this section is by M.E.Kalinke, 'Riddarasögur' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of Middle Ages* vol.10, New York, 1988, pp.389-97. This article is itself based upon a series of discussions of literary relations between England, France and Scandinavia, the first of which is H.G.Leach, *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1921, which is directly concerned with the political and economic connections between England and Scandinavia, and the subsequent literary results. Subsequent publications have tended to concentrate more upon the textual relations between the French and Scandinavian linguistic areas. General works on this subject include P.Aebischer, *Textes Norrois et Littérature Française du Moyen Âge* vol.1, Geneva, 1954; K.Togeb, 'L'Influence de la Littérature Française sur les Littératures Scandinaves au Moyen Âge' in H.U.Gumbrecht (ed.), *Grundriss der Romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters* vol.1, Heidelberg, 1972; *Les Relations Littéraires Franco-Scandinave au Moyen Age*, Actes du Colloque de Liège, Paris, 1975.

⁹⁶Kalinke in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.389.

⁹⁷*ibid.*

⁹⁸Following the treaty of Perth in 1266. The politics of this period are discussed by R.Williams, *The Lords of the Isles*, London, 1984, p.140.

⁹⁹Kalinke in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.390-1.

attractive for him to obtain some of the standard works of literature from the other regions of contemporary Britain¹⁰⁰. The royal patronage has considerable implications about possible fundamental reasons for the translation of these texts not only into Norse, but into other languages as well.

'Matter of Rome'

The 'Matter of Rome' in Old Norse comprises texts translated from Latin sources. There is an Old Norse translation of the *Pseudo-Dares Phrygius* called *Trójumanna Saga*¹⁰¹. In two extant manuscripts, this text serves as a preface to the translation of the *Historia Regum Britanniae* entitled *Breta Sögur*¹⁰². This juxtaposition recurs in Welsh, where a complete translation of the *Pseudo-Dares Phrygius* heads the translation of the *Historia Regum Britanniae*. However, the Norwegian situation is more complicated; to bridge the gap between the matter of *Pseudo-Dares Phrygius* and that of the *Historia Regum Britanniae*, a translator has incorporated material from the *Aeneid*¹⁰³. This greater liberty with the classical sources is more reminiscent of the Irish than the Welsh tradition. Nevertheless, the juxtaposition of the Troy story and the *Historia Regum Britanniae* in Welsh and Norwegian sources shows an interesting similarity of approach to the question of the diffusion of the Trojans and their establishment in Britain.

¹⁰⁰Leach, *op.cit.*, pp.49-56 (& elsewhere) discusses the close political relationship that Hákon IV established between himself and Henry III of England. This subject is considered more fully by K.Helle, 'Anglo-Norwegian Relations in the Reign of Hákon Hakonsson (1217-63)' in *Medieval Scandinavia* 1, 1968, pp.101-14.

¹⁰¹ed.J.Sigurdsson in *Annaler for Nordisk Old-kyndighed og Historie*, 1848, pp.102-215; 1849, pp.3-145.

¹⁰²See Leach, *op.cit.*, pp.130-34.

¹⁰³J.E.Knirk, 'Breta Sögur' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.2, New York, 1983, p.365.

*Alexanders Saga*¹⁰⁴ is a translation of the twelfth-century Latin *Alexandreis* of Walter of Châtillon¹⁰⁵, which was done by Brandr Jónson, Bishop of Hólar around 1260¹⁰⁶. In this case, there is no comparable text in Welsh. Alexander is the classic example of a conquering hero, and his life could have seemed very relevant to a Norwegian king trying to reassert his authority over the whole of his kingdom¹⁰⁷. While the Old Norse literature shows a certain interest in the 'Matter of Rome', there does not seem at first sight a need to have a complete ancient history as such. However, it can be observed here, as in English, that the classical epics were not used as source material for the 'Matter of Rome': Troy and Alexander, the 'core' subjects of classical history, are present, providing a background legend and a role model of an ancient warrior emperor for the Norwegian readership.

'Matter of France'¹⁰⁸

By far the most significant specimen of this matter in Old Norse is a long compilation of translations concerning Charlemagne - *Karlamagnús Saga*¹⁰⁹. Put together during the reign of Hákon IV, this text draws its material from a number of French chansons de geste and Latin historical works¹¹⁰. The comparability between the Norwegian and Welsh traditions noted in discussing the 'Matter of Rome' is also apparent with the 'Matter of France': of the ten sections in the compilation, four are translated from the four sources of the Welsh *Ystoria de Carolo Magno*: the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*,

¹⁰⁴ed.C.R.Unger, Oslo, 1848.

¹⁰⁵ed.M.Colker, Padua, 1978. This version of the Alexander story is not derived from the *Pseudo-Callisthenes* tradition but from the fifth-century *Historiae Alexandri* by Quintus Curtius. Hence, the source is unlike those used in England or Ireland. See G.Cary, *The Medieval Alexander*, Cambridge, 1956 for a detailed discussion of the textual traditions of Alexander.

¹⁰⁶L.Lönnroth, 'Alexanders Saga' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.1, New York, 1982, p.152. See also Leach, *op.cit.*, p.155.

¹⁰⁷The voyage of Hákon IV to the Hebrides, culminating in the Battle of Largs in 1263, had this purpose. R.Williams, *op.cit.*, pp.138-40.

¹⁰⁸Leach, *op.cit.*, pp.235-61.

¹⁰⁹ed.C.R.Unger, 2 vols., Oslo, 1860.

¹¹⁰The compilation is discussed by C.B.Hieatt, 'Karlamagnús Saga' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.7, New York, 1986, pp.216-9.

the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, the *Chanson d'Otinél* and the *Chanson de Roland*¹¹¹, the story of the Relics of the Passion taken as in Welsh from the third of these texts. As with the 'Matter of Rome', the range of sources employed by the Old Norse translators is the more extensive. Other source texts that were at least partially translated for *Karlamagnús Saga* are *Girart de Vienne*, *Ogier de Danemarche*, the *Chanson d'Aspremont*, the *Chanson des Saisnes*, and *Moniage Guillaume*¹¹². The total effect of *Karlamagnús Saga* is to present a picture of the heroic activities of Charlemagne and his knights against the pagans as a celebration of French chivalry.

One final source mentioned in the text is **Olif and Landres*, said in the prologue to its translation to have been found in Scotland¹¹³. This source text, which appears to have been in English¹¹⁴, has been lost, suggesting that it may have been a text written specifically as a present, or dowry, or for some such purpose¹¹⁵. It can be suggested that it would have entered the Old Norse-speaking areas in the Hebrides or the Northern Isles, which in turn asks if the West coast of Scotland was an important zone for the transmission of literary texts. However, in the absence of any direct evidence for this process, this is a complicated question, which need not be explored further here.

This range of 'Matter of France' material show how, in Norway as in Wales, the ethos of France could be recreated in court literature. To kings and princes who desired to be part of the French cultural sphere, Charlemagne provided a good exemplum for the Christian warrior ethos amongst the Scandinavian nations. This interest continued on

¹¹¹ *id.*, pp.216-7. See also P.Aebischer, *Les Versions Norroises du "Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient" - Leurs Sources*, Paris, 1956; P.Aebischer, *Études sur "Otinél"*, Berne, 1960; & C.B.Hiett, 'Karlamagnus Saga and the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle' in *Scandinavian Studies* 46, 1974, pp.140-50 for further discussion of these translations.

¹¹² Hicatt in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.216-7.

¹¹³ *ibid.*

¹¹⁴ *ibid.*

¹¹⁵ As relatively few medieval artifacts have survived from Scotland following the Wars of Independence with the English and the Protestant Reformation, the non-survival of a text written as a 'one-off' would not be surprising.

into the fifteenth century, and a number of Western Scandinavian adaptations were made, including the Danish *Karl Magnus Krønike*¹¹⁶.

The Norse tradition is fundamentally different from that of Ireland. The Fierabras story is not represented at all, the Relics of the Passion being obtained as a result of a pilgrimage by Charlemagne to the East. The Welsh and Scandinavian translations, like the English 'Otuel' group, represent a more archaic tradition than that represented in Ireland and in the English 'Firumbras' group. The Scandinavian aristocracy at the time of Hákon IV, like the Welsh patrons, also desired to read the same stories which had popularity in Norman England (and seemingly Scotland) during the thirteenth century. Wherever the sources may have been obtained, they were in French, rendering translations necessary, as French was not the native language of Wales or Scandinavia.

'Matter of Britain'

The earliest 'Matter of Britain' translation in Old Norse literature is that of the *Historia Regum Britanniae*, entitled *Breta Sögur*¹¹⁷, dated to just after 1200¹¹⁸. The history of the British kings would seem to be of less direct interest to the Kings of Norway than to the Princes of Wales. However, as the overlord of Man and the Scottish Islands, the Norwegian king could have perceived himself as one of the British kings, hence needing a pseudo-history to explain his right to rule like the Kings of England and the Princes of Wales. In addition, the *Historia Regum Britanniae* gave rise to Arthurian literature which saw knights who travelled not only in Britain, but all over the world on their quests. These knights came from the court of

¹¹⁶ Hielt in J.R. Strayer (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.218.

¹¹⁷ ed.J.Sigurðsson, *op.cit.* .

¹¹⁸ Knirk, *op.cit.*, in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.2, New York, 1983, p.366; Leach, *op.cit.* , pp.134-48.

the most exemplary Christian king, whom Hákon IV could regard as his role-model for perfect kingship¹¹⁹.

There are further examples of Arthurian texts in Old Norse translated from French sources. In similar fashion to the Welsh tradition, there are three romances which are definite translations of the three romances of Chrétien de Troyes associated with Britain, these being *Erec et Enide*, *Yvain*, and *Perceval*¹²⁰. The translation of *Yvain*, *Ívens Saga*¹²¹, is dedicated to King Hákon IV¹²². Although there is no firm evidence, the other romances appear to have been translated in the same period¹²³. These Norse translations might add weight to the idea that the versions of the same three works in Welsh, dating from the same period, are translations of the works of Chrétien himself.

In addition to these translations from Chrétien de Troyes, there are two further Old Norse texts with Arthurian themes, which similarly derive their material from twelfth-century French sources but which find no Welsh parallels. The first is *Tristrams Saga*¹²⁴, a translation of *Tristan* by Thomas¹²⁵, which was made by Brother Robert in 1226 for Hákon IV, the earliest dated translation of a 'Matter' romance¹²⁶. The second is a collection of lais, the *Strengleikar*,¹²⁷ which were translated by order of King Hákon IV¹²⁸. In this collection are twenty-one short prose texts. Eleven correspond with of the Breton lais of Marie de France, and six others also have extant French

¹¹⁹G. Barnes, 'The "Riddarasögur" and Mediaeval European Literature' in *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 8, 1975, pp.144-9 discusses Arthur in this role for Hákon.

¹²⁰Kalinke, *op.cit.*, in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.10, New York, 1988, p.390. See Leach, *op.cit.*, pp.228-30.

¹²¹ed.E.Kölbing, Halle, 1898.

¹²²F.W.Blaiddell, 'Ívens Saga' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.7, New York, 1986, p.20.

¹²³See F.W.Blaiddell, 'Erex Saga' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.4, New York, 1984, p.504; M.E.Kalinke, 'Parcevals Saga' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.9, New York, 1987, p.399.

¹²⁴ed.B.Vilhjálmsson in *Riddarasögur* vol.6, Reykjavik, 1954.

¹²⁵Leach, *op.cit.*, pp.169-98.

¹²⁶M.E.Kalinke, 'Riddarasögur' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.10, New York, 1988, p.390.

¹²⁷Leach, *op.cit.*, pp.199-26.

¹²⁸id., p.390.

originals which are not by Marie¹²⁹. All these texts continue to illustrate the interest of King Hákon texts popular in France during the twelfth century that exemplify Arthur as the exemplary king.

As in Welsh, there is only one example of a Norse 'Matter of Britain' text with an English subject, and this is *Beyvers Saga*¹³⁰, a translation of *Boeve de Hamtun*¹³¹. Like the Welsh translation, it was made directly from the French poem, and has been dated to the thirteenth century.

The Norse 'Matter of Britain' translations, like those of the other 'Matters', show similar traits to the Welsh. By and large, the thirteenth-century texts translated from French into Welsh were also translated into Old Norse¹³². Many of the latter have associations with King Hákon IV, who aspired to be a mainstream European king, with a right to be interested in the texts which were being read in other European courts. Whether there was any direct literary contact between Wales and Norway during this period is another question: for the time being, it suffices to say that there is no direct evidence for such contact.

One notable difference between the Norwegian and Welsh (and English) traditions is that there is no extant text concerning the Holy Grail after the translation of *Perceval*. This is indicative of the short time-scale within the thirteenth century during which the translations of 'Matter' literature into Old Norse were made. The Grail texts did not blossom in French until the thirteenth century, and were not translated into English, Welsh or Irish until the fourteenth and fifteenth century. Following the cession of the Hebrides, the union of Norway with Sweden in the early fourteenth

¹²⁹ R. Cook, 'Strengleikar' in J.R. Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.491-2 - only *Eliduc* of the Lais of Marie de France is missing from the translation.

¹³⁰ ed. B. Vilhjálmsen, *Riddarasögur* vol.1, Reykjavik, 1954, pp.283-398.

¹³¹ Leach, *op.cit.*, p.235.

¹³² This correlation between the two literatures has not been explored by any previous scholarship.

century, and the economic crises of the later fourteenth century¹³³, the patrons of Old Norse literature desired native compositions, and not exotica¹³⁴.

Résumé

The above survey of the translations into English, Welsh and Old Norse displays that the Irish translation tradition of 'Matter' literature did not operate in an identical fashion to any one of the other translation traditions reviewed. There are a number of points of comparison, in particular with the English tradition in the fifteenth century. However, the Irish tradition of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which witnessed the translation of 'Matter of Rome' texts, results from the scholastic study of Latin epics and histories in the cathedral schools of France from the eleventh century, and reflects the five main subjects of the twelfth and thirteenth-century Old French translations of these Latin sources. The 'Matter of Rome' is represented later in the other literary traditions. The classical epics were never used as source material; thirteenth-century Welsh and Irish employ late classical histories to provide the most important subjects of ancient history. The English tradition also uses these subjects almost exclusively, but uses later medieval Latin and French texts as sources.

By contrast with Ireland, many of the thirteenth-century English, Welsh and Old Norse texts were translated from French originals, and belonged for the most part to the 'Matter of France' and 'Matter of Britain'. The corpus of texts translated into Welsh and Old Norse is very similar: the Welsh and Norwegian taste ran to the epic and chivalric romance of the vernacular French tradition, whereas antiquity was of prime concern to the patrons of French and Irish translations from the Latin.

¹³³For a summary of the historical developments, see K.Helle, 'Norway' in J.R..Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.9, New York, 1987, pp.179-86.

¹³⁴Kalinke, *op.cit.*, in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.10, New York, 1988, pp.394-6. The bulk of literary activity moves to Iceland during the fourteenth century.

By the fourteenth century, after having followed very similar paths during the thirteenth century, first Norwegian and then Welsh translation activity ceased. The Norwegian court had developed a more introspective and isolated ethos, of which the cessation of Man and the Isles to the King of Scotland was one manifestation. Shortly afterwards, Princes of Wales had also lost their independence following the successful English Edwardian campaigns. However, the Welsh translators had made a translation concerning the subject which was to become most important in 'Matter of Britain' literature, the Holy Grail.

In English, which had gained increasing stature as a literary language in the fourteenth century, a sizeable number of translations were made of all three 'Matters': from Latin sources for the 'Matter of Rome', and from French sources for the other two 'Matters'. This last reflected the popularity of prose adaptations of Old French romances for the widening literary market in France in the period of recovery following the Black Death. The Relics of the Passion, in particular the Grail, became very important subjects for both the 'Matter of France' and 'Matter of Britain' during the fifteenth century: it was at this stage, the Fierabras story made its entrance into the English romance tradition. Around the year 1400, Ireland was involved only in a limited way in these developments, as evidenced by the 'Matter of France' translations taken from Latin sources. However, the manuscripts of the period around 1400 reveal that some of the earlier 'Matter of Rome' texts were being recopied, an activity which may bear comparison with the popularity of the same themes in the English tradition at that time.

The latest development in English was the translating of texts into English prose for the purpose of printing. Texts from all three 'Matters' were translated, notably by Caxton himself, generally using updated French prose romances as source material. It is at approximately this stage, and perhaps connected with the spread of printed

books, that the Irish translators appear to have become increasingly interested in events in English, especially those influenced by Burgundian literary tastes. From this phase there is extant, most notably, the translation of a Grail text of the type printed in Caxton's English edition; also, during this time somebody reworked the 'Matter of France' texts to form a larger history of Charlemagne and the Saracens, a compilation of which the Fierabras story formed one of the two major parts.

CHAPTER TWO**THE FIERABRAS STORY IN THE LITERATURE
OF FRANCE, ENGLAND AND IRELAND****SECTION ONE****THE *CHANSON DE FIERABRAS* AND THE RELICS
OF THE PASSION IN LATER MEDIEVAL FRANCE**

An idea which developed in France during the eleventh and twelfth centuries was that a number of Relics of the Passion, including the Crown of Thorns, had been obtained by Charlemagne and brought back to France¹. Even after the arrival of the Crown of Thorns in Paris in the middle of the thirteenth century, the tradition of Charlemagne bringing the Relics continued to be copied. The *Chanson de Fierabras* became the most influential text in this tradition². In addition to its transmission to Ireland and England, this poem was one of the most frequently copied and adapted of the chansons de geste in later medieval France. The aim of this chapter is to illustrate the historical and literary provenance of the Fierabras story, and to suggest why this particular story became popular during the later Middle Ages. This opening section will consider the *Chanson de Fierabras* and the other texts of the tradition concerning Charlemagne and the Relics of the Passion, and illustrate their uses and spread both before and after the arrival of the Crown of Thorns in Paris.

¹These subjects have received the greatest attention in J.Bédier, *Les Légendes Épiques - Recherches sur la Formation des Chansons de Geste* vol.4, Paris, 1913, pp.122-67. Bédier had commenced his enquiry into the *Chanson de Fierabras* some years earlier with 'La Composition de *Fierabras*' in *Romania* 17, 1888, pp.22-51, in which he suggests a number of potential sources for the poem as found in the manuscripts. For a general historical background to the political developments of the era, see E.Hallam, *Capetian France, 987-1328*, London, 1980.

²ed. A.Kræber & G.Servois in *Chanson de Fierabras. Parise la Duchesse*, Anciens Poètes de France vol.4, Paris, 1860, pp.1-204. The Fierabras story has been most fully discussed by A.de Mandach, *Naissance et Développement de la Chanson de Geste en Europe* vol.5, Geneva, 1987. This volume is entirely devoted to the origins of the story, and provides a complete list of all the manuscripts in which the story is preserved. It has been augmented by A. de Mandach (ed.), 'Table Ronde sur la Geste de Fierabras, Partie 2' in *Anonyme* 1987, pp.1209- 413.

Charlemagne and the Relics of the Passion - the Texts

The idea that Charlemagne had been a relic collector was not new in the eleventh century. In the late tenth century the Italian monk Benedictus de Sancto Andrea described a journey made by Charlemagne to Jerusalem and Constantinople, during which he was given a relic which he later donated to the Benedictus's monastery³. Early stories like this were able to provide some inspiration for the late eleventh and twelfth-century crusaders: at least they were following the route of Charlemagne to the Holy Land⁴.

The tradition that Charlemagne had obtained the Relics of the Passion, including the Crown of Thorns, and had brought them back to France appears to have developed from the middle of the eleventh century. There are three texts that comprise this tradition, and they are all distinguished by one important feature. In each text, some of the most important Relics, most notably the Crown of Thorns (complete or in fragments), come to be presented to the monastery of St. Denis, the sepulchre of the Capetian kings, for preservation. Certain Relics of the Passion did indeed arrive at St. Denis during the middle of the eleventh century; a result of their arrival was the inauguration of the annual 'Lendit' fairs in their honour. The three texts provided stories that could explain how these Relics had been obtained by Charlemagne, how they came to be located in St. Denis, and why the Lendit fairs themselves were started⁵. However, the texts were not composed at the same time, and each text presents a unique account.

³ed. K.Hahn in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica - Scriptorum*, vol.3, Hannover, 1839, p.708.

⁴R.Folz, *Le Souvenir et la Légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire Germanique Médiéval*, Paris, 1950, pp.134-8.

⁵The first important discussion is that of Bédier, *op.cit.*, pp.137-41; this was augmented and refined by L.Levillain in 'Essai sur les Origines du Lendit', *Revue Historique* 155, 1927, pp.241-76.

The earliest text in this tradition is the Latin prose *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus Clavum et Coronam Domini a Constantinopoli Aquisgrani Detulerit*⁶. Probably written around the last quarter of the eleventh century⁷, it provided a factual account of the journey of Charlemagne to the East where he was awarded the Relics in return for liberating the Patriarch of Jerusalem from the Saracens. The second text is the early or mid twelfth-century *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*⁸, which seems to be a parody based on the story told in the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....*⁹, concentrating on the rivalry between Eastern and Western Christians after Charlemagne had received certain Relics as a gift from the Byzantine emperor. Like the *Chanson de Fierabras*, which is itself most likely to have been written during the late twelfth century¹⁰, the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* is written in French verse, and would appear to have had a greater artistic motivation behind its composition than the Latin prose text.

The *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus* and the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* present their subject matter in a totally different way to the *Chanson de Fierabras*. In the chanson de geste, the Relics are rescued by Charlemagne following a conflict between Charlemagne and the Saracens, who had previously stolen the Relics. The action is set in Spain, hence making the subject matter more akin to that of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* and the *Chanson de Roland*. The first task in this section is to provide a more detailed summary of these texts themselves, so that their different accounts can be more carefully considered in relation to the history of the Relics of

⁶ed.G.Rauschen in *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Gesichtskunde vol.7, Leipzig, 1890, pp.103-25. More recently edited by F.Castets as 'Iter Hierosolymitanum' in *Revue des Langues Romanes* 36, 1892, pp.417-74.

⁷Bédier, *op.cit.*, p.127.

⁸ed.G.S.Burgess in G.S.Burgess & A.E.Corby, *The Pilgrimage of Charlemagne and Aucassin and Nicolette*, New York & London, 1988, pp.1-92.

⁹Burgess, *op.cit.*, p.11; Bédier, *op. cit.*, pp.154-6.

¹⁰Bédier, *op.cit.*, p157. Also de Mandach, *op.cit.*, p.126 describes the dating of the Fierabras story as a contentious subject. However, a date of around 1180 is the most generally accepted by both scholars.

the Passion in France. Of the summaries, that of the *Chanson de Fierabras* is longer than those of the other two texts, which reflects the longer length of this text.

Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....

This history is a good example of a 'Matter of France' text written in Latin prose. The prose medium lent the text a certain authenticity, implying that the information recorded in the text was historically accurate. Although the text by itself is preserved in only four manuscripts¹¹, its historical value led to a short précis of the story being included in both the *Speculum Historiale* by Vincent of Beauvais¹², and the *Grandes Chroniques de France*¹³, two highly authoritative historical compilations. Here follows an abstract of the text, indicating the role of the Relics of the Passion¹⁴.

Charlemagne is invited by the Byzantine Emperor to liberate the Holy Land from the hands of the Saracens and to place the Patriarch of Jerusalem in his rightful seat. After all this has been accomplished, the Byzantine Emperor wishes to repay Charlemagne by means of presents. Charlemagne desires none of the presents save the Relics of the Passion. These Relics had been buried in silver boxes by Helen, mother of Constantine, and the boxes had been found after excavation. The authenticity of the Relics is proved by miracles. The inventory of the Relics is as follows: spines of the Crown of Thorns; a piece of wood from the Crown; a Nail from the Cross; wood from the Cross; the Holy Shroud; the Robe of the Virgin; the Swaddling Clothes of Jesus; an arm of Simeon.

¹¹J.Coulet, *Études sur l'Ancien Poème Français du Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient*, Montpellier, 1907, p.169, n.1.

¹²See Castets, *op.cit.*, p.418.

¹³*id.*, p.428.

¹⁴Bédier, *op.cit.*, pp.123-4.

All the Relics are taken by Charlemagne to Aachen, his imperial capital, where the Lendit fair is first celebrated in honour of the Relics. Following the death of Charlemagne, his grandson Charles the Bald founds the abbey of Compiègne, which is to be under the jurisdiction of St. Denis. Both of these abbeys receive a portion of the Relics of the Passion, and the Lendit fair is then transferred from Aachen to St. Denis.

The themes of this text were very relevant to the politics of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries. The story was further able to illustrate how the crusades to liberate the East from the yoke of the infidel were following in the footsteps of Charlemagne. It also indicates how the Eastern Roman Emperor was to an extent dependent on the help of the Western Emperor for assistance in the defence of the Holy Land. In the text, the Relics of the Passion are able, by means of Helena, to connect Charlemagne directly with Constantine, showing the continuation of the Roman Empire from antiquity down to the Carolingian era. Then, by means of the Relics and the Lendit fair, St. Denis is connected directly to Aachen, indicating how the French court, based in the Île de France, was a direct descendant of the court of Charlemagne himself.

Pèlerinage de Charlemagne

The *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* is a short poem in French, written in chanson de geste metre, preserved in a single manuscript of the thirteenth century¹⁵. The poem, which has a substantial comic element in its narrative, appears to be based on the Latin text, although the storyline is somewhat different¹⁶. Although the text is represented in the thirteenth and early fourteenth-century 'Matter of France' compilations in English, Welsh and Old Norse, the fact that it is only preserved in a single manuscript is not indicative of widespread popularity in France itself.

¹⁵MS. Royal 16 E VIII. See Burgess., *op.cit.*, p.1.

¹⁶*id.*, p.11.

At the start of the poem, Charlemagne is taunted by his queen that the Byzantine Emperor Hugo the Strong is mightier than he¹⁷. Charlemagne, wishing to meet this man, musters his army and sets off for the East, on the pretext of going on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem¹⁸. On arrival in Jerusalem, Charlemagne is mistaken for Christ¹⁹. As a result, a number of relics, including some of the Relics of the Passion, are given to him by the Patriarch. These include a piece of the Holy Shroud, one of the Nails of the Cross, the Crown of Thorns, the chalice, bowl and knife from the Last Supper, a lock of the hair of Peter, a vial of milk of the Virgin, and a piece of the Virgin's Robe²⁰.

After his stay in Jerusalem, Charlemagne sets off for Constantinople, where it is revealed to him that the Byzantine Emperor does indeed possess a more magnificent court²¹. At this stage, the text abandons the Relics in order to describe a confrontation between Eastern and Western Christians. Following a feast and much boasting, the superiority of Charlemagne's Western forces is demonstrated by his men being able to accomplish the feats about which they boasted by means of divine aid²². Charlemagne, acknowledged as the superior ruler, returns to Paris, places the Crown of Thorns and a Nail of the Cross on the altar at St. Denis²³, and distributes the other Relics.

That Charlemagne is made to undertake his journey for selfish reasons indicates that this text was not written in the same spirit as a *chanson de geste*; not dealing solely with heroes, the text is interested in the ego of a more complicated character who, as well as being a hero, is also a king and a human being. The Relics are obtained as a

¹⁷id., pp.30-2, *laissez* 1-4, l.9-57.

¹⁸id., pp.32-4, *laissez* 5-7, l.58-111.

¹⁹id., p.36, *laisse* 9, l.130-50.

²⁰id., p.38, *laissez* 10-1, l.166-89.

²¹id., pp.42-48, *laissez* 17-22, l.259-414.

²²id., pp.62-68, *laissez* 42-50, l.579-801.

²³id., p.70, *laisse* 55, l.862-4.

result of a bad case of mistaken identity rather than by a heroic geste in the name of Christ. Thus, although the result is the same as in the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus...*, the route taken is not what would be expected in a poem whose form is that of a chanson de geste.

Chanson de Fierabras

The *Chanson de Fierabras* is very different. It is a pure chanson de geste, designed to emphasise the unity of France and to incite the crusading spirit. Compared to the two texts previously discussed, it enjoyed relative popularity during the later Middle Ages. In addition to its derivative versions in French, English and Hiberno-Latin/Irish, fourteen copies or fragments of the chanson de geste itself are extant, dating from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century²⁴. In conjunction with texts like the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, it can be seen as forming part of a history of the wars of Charlemagne against the Spanish Muslims, the recovery of the Relics of the Passion being the most important feature in this particular episode.

The *Chanson de Fierabras* is set primarily in Spain. The army of Charlemagne, including the twelve peers, sets off to recapture the Relics of the Passion, including the Crown of Thorns²⁵. These Relics had been captured by the Saracen leader Admiral Balan and his son Fierabras when they sacked Rome²⁶. This mission embodies the ideals of the crusading movement: a justification for the reconquest of land and the rescue of holy relics from the Saracens. It also emphasises the unity of the lords of France under one overlord, who is also the Roman Emperor, the secular head of Catholic Europe. The Islamic world is similarly portrayed as a unity under

²⁴De Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.165-7. The summary list of manuscripts of the *Chanson de Fierabras* and the derivative texts.

²⁵See the author's prologue, Kræber & Servois, *op.cit.*, pp.1-2, laisse 1, l.1-22.

²⁶*id.*, pp.2-3, laisse 2, l.46-66.

Balan and Fierabras. Thus Charlemagne and Balan are the religious and the political heads of a divided world.

The action which preceded the final Christian triumph involves a number of stages. First, the Saracen giant Fierabras challenges Charlemagne or any of the peers to single combat²⁷. Charlemagne asks Roland, who refuses. A quarrel results²⁸. Subsequently, Fierabras is defeated in single combat by the wounded Christian knight Oliver²⁹, emphasising the influence of divine aid, and the superiority of Christian military prowess. Following this defeat, Fierabras acknowledges that Christianity is the true religion, and is baptised³⁰.

Oliver and other Christian knights are captured by the Saracen troops, and imprisoned in the Spanish city of Aigremore. After having been condemned to death, they are saved by Floripes, the daughter of Balan and sister of Fierabras³¹. Although the reason for her aid is still a secret at this time, it is the divinely inspired treason of this Saracen woman that starts the process by which her father is eventually defeated.

Meanwhile, Charlemagne and Balan send embassies to one another³². The Christian ambassadors, a party of French dukes led by Roland, defeat the Saracen ambassadors when they encounter each other³³, demonstrating the Christian superiority in one-to-one situations. On arrival at Aigremore, they too are condemned to death, but they too are saved by Floripes, who reunites them with the other captured knights³⁴. She has in

²⁷id., pp.3-4, laisses 3-4, l.77-110.

²⁸id., pp.5-7, laisses 5-6, l.143-96.

²⁹id., pp.12-46, laisses 12-38, l.362-1506.

³⁰id., pp.55-7, laisses 47-8, l.1781-863.

³¹id., pp.57-67, laisses 48-56, l.1863-2200.

³²id., pp.69-72, laisses 56-58, l.2256-374.

³³id., pp.72-8, laisse 58, l.2375-569.

³⁴id., pp.82-4, laisse 63, l.2712-79.

the meantime revealed that her reason for saving them is her love for Guy of Burgundy³⁵, who is one of the party of ambassadors.

With the help of Floripes, the Christian knights expel the Saracens from the palace³⁶. They then smash the pagan idol deities, an action designed to show the strength of the Christians in a very difficult situation³⁷. The French dukes now occupy what had been the centre of Saracen control. However, they are isolated and the army of Balan remains a threat outside. Either this Christian infiltration to the Muslim core will be expunged, or it will hold out to connect with the main force of Christendom, represented by the armies of Charlemagne.

Floripes owns a girdle which would save any of her party from feeling hunger during the period of the siege. Knowing of this magic girdle, Balan sends a thief to steal it. Guy, who was ignorant of the powers of the girdle, catches the thief and throws him outside, wearing the girdle³⁸. This accident necessitates an expedition for food, during which Guy is first captured, and then liberated by Roland³⁹. At this point, Richard of Normandy is sent to Charlemagne to bring the rest of the French army to help the besieged knights in an act of French unity⁴⁰. Due to the treason of Ganelon, Charlemagne had been on the point of departing, when Richard arrives⁴¹. The idea of treachery within the Christian ranks creates a suspense, although the arrival of Richard shows how divine help can not allow such treachery to succeed.

The remainder of the text is taken up with the final, and principal, battle between all the Christians and all the Saracens near the city of Aigremore⁴². The army of

³⁵id., pp.68-9, laisse 56, l.2223-55.

³⁶id., pp.90-2, laisse 70, l.2967-3042.

³⁷id., p.96, laisse 72, l.3155-82.

³⁸id., pp.92-3, laisse 71, l.3043-111.

³⁹id., pp.97-110, laisses 73-82, l.3204-643.

⁴⁰id., pp.120-1, laisses 87-8, l.3995-4011.

⁴¹id., pp.133-40, laisses 99-104, l.4402-622.

⁴²id., pp.155-77, laisses 119-40, l.5134-861.

Charlemagne liberate the besieged knights, and Charlemagne defeats Balan in single combat. Henceforth, all Saracen power is destroyed. With his son and daughter both converted to Christianity, Balan remains defiant. Despite attempts to convert him, he refuses, and is killed⁴³. The Saracen lands are then divided between Fierabras and Guy, husband of Floripes⁴⁴. Thus they are kept in the same family, but under the flag of Christendom. The Relics of the Passion are taken into France and some, including part of the Crown of Thorns and a Nail, are deposited at Saint Denis⁴⁵, with others going to Compiègne.

This chanson de geste embodies a number of themes of interest. It illustrates how quarrels could undermine the unity of Christianity, which was necessary to defeat the Saracens. However, it shows how the Christian message could be given to the pagans as a result of a divinely inspired military performance, and how the honourable, but defeated, infidel would convert to Christ. Similarly, a pagan woman could convert because of her love for a Christian knight, a love that overpowers even the strongest ties associated with her original faith.

As with the other texts in this group, the *Chanson de Fierabras* shows how the Crown of Thorns came to be preserved at St. Denis. However, in this case, they were given to St. Denis by Charlemagne himself, who had obtained them as a result of direct military action, and not as gifts. Hence, St. Denis is connected more directly with the emperor himself, and rescue of Crown of Thorns embodies the ideals of the crusades against the Saracens.

At some stage, an additional text, *La Destruction de Rome*⁴⁶, was written to provide a detailed account of how Rome was destroyed at the hands of Fierabras and the

⁴³id., p.181, laisse 143, l.5984-990.

⁴⁴id., p.182, laisse 143, l.6020-2.

⁴⁵id., p.187, laisses 150-1, l.6187-205.

⁴⁶ed.L.Formisano, Florence, 1981.

Saracen army. This prefatory text, in the *chanson de geste* metre, is attributed to one Gautier de Douai, whose history is not certain⁴⁷. The existence of this text suggests that the history of the theft of Relics of the Passion from Rome was felt to need more emphasis: the real aim was to make more of the action of the history as a whole take place in Rome. For Charlemagne, the King of France, is also the Emperor of Rome. Thus, the role of the King of France as the chief emperor of Christendom is reinforced.

The Texts and the Relics - The Historical Background

Developments in the Eleventh and Twelfth centuries - St. Denis and the Origins of the Tradition

As mentioned earlier, the first the Relics of the Passion at St. Denis arrived during the middle of the eleventh century. The first arrival occurred in 1047, after which the Lendit fair was instituted. It is most likely that this fair was first held in 1048⁴⁸, and continued to be held thereafter. The *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus* was most probably written during the later part of the century to advertise, somewhat fictitiously, that among Relics that they possessed were the Crown of Thorns, a Holy Nail and fragment of the True Cross which had originally been brought to Europe by Charlemagne himself⁴⁹. This account promoted the importance of St. Denis and the Lendit fair. It also yielded useful propaganda for the nascent crusading movement by demonstrating the journey of Charlemagne in the name of Christ.

⁴⁷de Mandach, *op.cit.*, ch.9, pp.109-26 is devoted to this subject. Three canons by this name are identified, whose dates range from 1030 to 1208, pp.113-4. Although the eleventh-century person is favoured by de Mandach, the arguments are far from conclusive. A date around the twelfth century for the composition of the text is more likely, cognate with the date of the composition of the *Chanson de Fierabras*.

⁴⁸Levillain, *op.cit.*, p.266, based on a document entitled *Detectio Corporum Macharii Areopagitae Dionysii Sociorumque eius*.

⁴⁹id., p.262 concludes that the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....*, was probably composed around 1080.

This situation was complicated in the early twelfth century by the establishment of a second Lendit fair⁵⁰. This fair was established during the reign of King Louis VI, and managed by the members of Notre-Dame. It started following a gift to the king in 1108 of a fragment of the True Cross from the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. This Relic was presented to the Bishop of Paris⁵¹. In 1109, the chapter then decided to take this fragment on procession to the plain to the South of St. Denis, to a place named 'le Champ du Lendit', a fief of the Bishop of Paris⁵². In this field was 'le Perron du Lendit', where the bishop preached a sermon. This procession became an annual event and would attract a large crowd. Hence this second and royal fair of Lendit developed.

The lands of the Bishop of Paris adjoined those of St. Denis⁵³. Consequently, the two fairs of Lendit, held in adjacent lands, were now in direct competition with each other. The monks of St. Denis did not want their own fair to lose out to the glory which had been gained by the Bishop of Paris from the royal fair. The *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus* served the purpose of showing that St. Denis also possessed a fragment of the True Cross, along with some of the other more important Relics of the Passion⁵⁴. Thus the text showed that St. Denis was the major depository of the Relics compared to Notre Dame, which merely had the royal fragment of the True Cross. Consequently, the status of the monastery was maintained.

The efforts of the monks gained a certain degree of success in 1124, when Louis VI conceded the revenues of the royal fair to the monastery of St. Denis⁵⁵. As the benefactors of both the fairs of Lendit, the monks could have justifiably claimed to be

⁵⁰id., pp.248ff discusses the origins of this second fair, the information being derived from charters of Louis VI and the records of Abbot Suger; id., p.271 notes the coexistence of the two fairs.

⁵¹Bédier, *op.cit.*, p.137; id., pp.137-40 is the clearest description of this second fair.

⁵²id., p.139.

⁵³id., p.138.

⁵⁴Levillain, *op.cit.*, p.257.

⁵⁵Bédier, *op.cit.*, p.139.

the most important abbey of France at the centre of the Capetian Kingdom, owning the Relics of the Passion and the royal tombs. However, the Bishop of Paris continued to manage the royal fair, and the competition between the two fairs continued for a further century. It is this period of rivalry between St. Denis and Notre-Dame that would have provided the ideal motivation for the composition of the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, a literary parody that explored the idea of rivalry between the Christians⁵⁶.

A new dimension was added to the rivalry between the two fairs in 1205 when King Philip Augustus presented to St. Denis some more Relics, including a further fragment of the True Cross which had been recently acquired from Constantinople⁵⁷. As a result, the inventory of the Relics at St. Denis was strengthened by a direct input from the king, giving the monks a further pre-eminence in their rivalry with the Bishop of Paris. This gift of Relics occurred at around the same time that the *Chanson de Fierabras* is likely to have been first composed⁵⁸. This is surely no coincidence, as the *chanson de geste* described how the Crown of Thorns and the Nails had come to rest in St. Denis as a result of a direct gift from Charlemagne after he had rescued them from the hands of the Spanish Saracens. From this account, Philip Augustus could be compared directly with Charlemagne as emperor and crusader.

The gift of Philip Augustus serves to highlight the underlying reasons behind the composition of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. The connection between the king and Charlemagne had wide-ranging political implications. The Capetian kings, who had been politically weak in the eleventh century and sought to expand their power base, required stories to show that their kingdom was a direct descendant of the empire of

⁵⁶See Burgess, *op.cit.*, pp.5-6 for a discussion of some of the less-than-usual features of the text. See note 62 below.

⁵⁷Levillain, *op.cit.*, p.272, based on the *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, Ch.145.

⁵⁸See above, note 10.

Charlemagne, the great unifier of 'France' and Christendom⁵⁹. From the time of Philip Augustus, the Capetian kings had become increasingly interested in achieving French political unity⁶⁰. By suggesting that the royal monastery of St. Denis possessed some of the most important Christian relics, the position of the king in France and Christian Europe would have been reinforced.

Furthermore, twelfth-century France would have required epic stories that justified the crusading movement by describing the voyages of Charlemagne to either the Holy Land or Spain to obtain the Relics of the Passion from the Saracens. For from the time of the First Crusade in 1098, France had been in the vanguard of the crusading movement. Philip Augustus was himself a major figure in the crusading movement, playing a particularly active role in the Third Crusade from 1189-91⁶¹. There can be little doubt that the composition of the *Chanson de Fierabras* around this period would, along with the other chansons de geste, have provided excellent propaganda in the vernacular for the objectives of the crusaders. Philip Augustus could be regarded as following the path of Charlemagne, promoting both French unity and the crusades against the Saracens⁶². In this light, the utmost symbolic importance of the gift of the Relics of the Passion to St. Denis by both himself and Charlemagne becomes quite apparent. It could not be doubted that Paris was a principal centre of Western Christendom.

⁵⁹For a discussion of the propagation of the use of vernacular French literature, see K.D.Uitti, 'French Literature: to 1200' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.234-6.

⁶⁰J.W.Baldwin in 'France: 987-1223' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.162-5 discusses the imposition of royal supremacy over France from 1190-1223 during the reign of Philip Augustus. More detailed general discussion by R-H. Bautier (ed.), *La France de Philippe Auguste: Le Temps des Mutations*, Paris, 1982.

⁶¹J.H.Hill, 'Crusades to 1192' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.4, New York, 1984, p.40.

⁶²Note: the unifying activities of Philip Augustus may help to explain why it was the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* that was chosen for translation into English, Welsh and Old Norse; perhaps the loss of English possessions in France during the reign of Philip Augustus could be seen reflected in a quarrel between the two emperors. In any case, the currency of the text in thirteenth-century Britain suggests that the concept of Christian rivalry had a certain added importance to the British courts.

Developments in the Thirteenth Century - The Sainte-Chapelle and the *Chanson de Fierabras*⁶³

Although the Crown of Thorns did eventually come to Paris, the actual history is somewhat different to the accounts presented by the texts described above⁶⁴. In 1237 King Louis IX discussed the possible purchase of a number of Relics of the Passion from the visiting Byzantine Emperor Baudoin II. Up to that point, these Relics were being preserved in the Bucoleon in Constantinople. In 1239 Louis bought the Crown of Thorns via a Venetian intermediary, and, after having been brought to Paris, the Crown was placed in the chapel of St. Nicholas. In 1241 a number of other Relics were purchased from Constantinople: these included wood from the True Cross, fragments of the Holy Spear, the Robe of the Virgin, the Holy Sponge and the Holy Shroud. It came to be felt that a new, purpose-built chapel was needed to house these new Relics. Thus was conceived the Sainte-Chapelle.

The Sainte-Chapelle was built adjacent to the royal palace on the Île de la Cité between 1243 and 1248 under direction from Louis IX himself⁶⁵. Its sole purpose was to set the Relics of the Passion in the most beautiful setting attainable, that is in a golden, bejewelled shrine within a radiant Gothic building illuminated through magnificent stained glass. On this stained glass were depicted Biblical scenes⁶⁶, and images showing the discovery of the True Cross by Helena, and the Crown of Thorns being given to Louis in Venice⁶⁷. It was clearly intended that the chapel should become a symbol of the power of the Kingdom of France within Western Christendom⁶⁸. By displaying the central relics of the Christian faith to the world, it

⁶³The history of the Sainte-Chapelle is well described by L.Grodecki, *Sainte-Chapelle*, Paris, 196? (Date missing from volume)

⁶⁴*id.*, p.12 provides all the information for this paragraph, based on the primary source entitled *Historia Susceptionis Coronae Spineae Christi*.

⁶⁵*id.*, p.14.

⁶⁶*id.*, pp.104-14.

⁶⁷*id.*, p.115.

⁶⁸*id.*, p.92.

promoted Paris as one of the contemporary centres of Christendom, and certainly would have been able to give the French king a justifiable claim to be a 'Roman' monarch, the equal of the German Holy Roman Emperor.

During the reign of Louis IX, the effective power of the French king, based in Paris, reached its zenith, extending over all of France and beyond⁶⁹. This increase in prestige and power was a direct continuation of the process that had started during the reign of Philip Augustus. During his reign, Louis saw the installation of his brother, Charles of Anjou, as King of Sicily, whose own personal influence extended over Rome and the crusader state in the Eastern Mediterranean⁷⁰. Louis also realised some of his own crusading ambitions⁷¹, and the chansons de geste concerning Charlemagne gained added point through their capacity to prefigure the actions taken by Louis. A unified account, summarising the matter of the chansons de geste, together with other historical texts, was written in 1243 by Philip Mousket. His work, the *Chroniques Rimées*⁷², established a relationship between these epic and historical texts, and included a suitably adapted version of the Fierabras story.

It is not surprising that the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle had some effect on the literature of the thirteenth century. It created the ideal occasion for the propagation of a history of how the Relics of the Passion ended up in Paris. However, a new history relating how Louis had purchased the Crown of Thorns was not composed. The idea that Charlemagne had obtained the Crown of Thorns, which had eventually come to be preserved at St. Denis, persisted for the following reasons: first, the royal monastery in the thirteenth century would not have desired to lose importance

⁶⁹This power is noted by W.C.Jordan in 'France: 1223-1328' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.166.

⁷⁰W.C.Jordan, 'Angevins: France, England, Sicily' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.1, New York, 1982, p.253.

⁷¹W.C.Jordan, 'Louis IX of France' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.7, New York, 1986, p.675 connects the crusading spirit with the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle. This article is a summary of the more detailed work by Jordan entitled *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade*, Princeton, 1979.

⁷²Described by R.N.Walpole, 'Chronique Rimée' in *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age*, Paris, 1964, p.191.

because of the Sainte-Chapelle; and second, the military rescue of the Crown of Thorns by Charlemagne would have been symbolically more influential than its purchase by Louis IX. Additionally, if Charlemagne had obtained the Relics, he could not have placed them in the Sainte-Chapelle. In its capacity as the royal monastery that controlled the Lendit fair, an institution started by Charlemagne, St. Denis was the most suitable alternative. For these reasons, a true history would have resulted in both St. Denis and the Lendit fair losing credibility, and would have weakened the direct connection between the Capetians and Charlemagne.

Due to these pressures, it is not unexpected that a previously written text concerning the Crown of Thorns and St. Denis came to be employed to relate the rather fictitious history that resulted in the Sainte-Chapelle. As has been suggested earlier, of the three texts, it was the *Chanson de Fierabras* that became by far the most prominent, illustrated by relatively large number of extant manuscripts of the text dating from the thirteenth century and after⁷³. These manuscripts were written not only in Northern France, but also in England and Occitania. It must be asked why the popularity of this text developed, a popularity that subsequently led to the story being adapted into French prose and translated into other languages in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

It can be hypothesised that the *Chanson de Fierabras* was adopted as the history which gave the best account of the obtaining of the Relics for France. The *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* may have been overlooked on account of its unconventional attitude to the subject matter. However, it must be admitted that the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....* would have seemed a more obvious choice, as a Latin prose text in a historical genre. Indeed, the précis in both the *Speculum Historiale* and the

⁷³De Mandach, *op.cit.*, p.125 notes how the St.Denis is replaced by the Sainte-Chapelle in two French prose adaptations of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, and considers that a version of the *chanson de geste* that did likewise was possibly composed after 1248.

Grandes Chroniques de France suggest that certain historians were regarding this account as authentic. Hence, the popularity of the *Chanson de Fierabras* must be dependent on other factors: the answer must lie in the subject matter of the story itself⁷⁴.

In the *Chanson de Fierabras*, the Relics of the Passion are stolen from Rome, the Papal capital. They are taken directly to the Paris region by Charlemagne himself, blatantly illustrating the idea of Paris as the thirteenth-century centre of Catholic Christendom. Also, the Relics are recaptured after a war in Spain, thus making the story a natural historical partner to the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, and hence useful for the historians of Charlemagne and his wars in Spain. Finally, the *chanson de geste* form would have promoted, in the vernacular, the warrior nature of Charlemagne and the unity of the French under his leadership, just as in the *Chanson de Roland*. This would have given both the French monarchy and the crusaders an appropriate role model and paradigm for their own activities during the thirteenth century.

In all these points, the *Chanson de Fierabras* differs from the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....*. In the latter, the Relics are obtained as a gift rather than spoils, and are transferred from Constantinople to Aachen. This is a connection that does not express a direct relationship between Charlemagne and Paris or St. Denis, and does not permit such an obvious parallel to be drawn between Charlemagne and the Capetian kings themselves. In addition, the war with the Saracens is set in the Holy Land itself, and does not dominate the story. Hence, the account was not able to provide such a good model for the ideals needed by crusaders; Spain was perceived to be the principal area of conflict between Charlemagne and the infidels, and consequently the *Chanson de Fierabras* provided a more suitable account. The

⁷⁴It can be asked if it was the medium of Latin prose that prevented the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....* from becoming popular. However, as it witnessed by the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, French translations of Latin prose texts were made.

transfer of the Relics from Constantinople to France may be more historically accurate. But despite the incorporation of this text into two major historical compilations, this sort of accuracy was clearly of limited value⁷⁵, at a time when the Capetian dynasty was reaching the height of its power. The Fierabras story could better promote the ideals of the time.

The Manuscript Tradition of the *Chanson de Fierabras*⁷⁶

The *Chanson de Fierabras* survives whole or in part in fourteen manuscripts written in France and England dating from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century. Such widespread survival testifies to the popularity of the text in these French-speaking areas in the later middle ages. The manuscripts can be divided into three basic groups⁷⁷. The vast majority contain a form of the unabbreviated chanson de geste written in Old French⁷⁸. It survives in twelve manuscripts from Northern France, and England. Some of the manuscripts contain mere fragments of the text, while others are complete. In certain manuscripts that contain the complete text, the *Chanson de Fierabras* is preceded by *La Destruction de Rome*. In others, it is combined with other chansons de geste⁷⁹.

⁷⁵Naturally, it is not clear to what extent the 'history' provided by the *Chanson de Fierabras* was actually considered to be the exact truth. But even if a later thirteenth-century audience knew that the story was false, it is still the account that gained the greatest popularity.

⁷⁶A complete list of the manuscripts containing versions of the *Chanson de Fierabras* can be found among the list of manuscripts given by de Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.168-86.

⁷⁷The study of these versions was commenced by H.Jarnik, 'Studie über die Komposition der Fierabrasdichtungen', Halle, 1903. The most important early study of the manuscripts was by R.Mehnert, 'Neue Beiträge zum Handschriftenverhältnis der *Chanson de Fierabras*', diss. Göttingen, 1938, who attempted to classify the manuscripts containing the *Chanson de Fierabras* into groups. A useful study in itself, however it does not explain anything about the historical background to the manuscripts, which is of considerably greater importance when considering the potential interpretations of the Fierabras story.

⁷⁸This is the version edited by Kræber & Servois, *op. cit.*.

⁷⁹Note, the chief purpose of de Mandach, *op.cit.*, is to discuss the idea that the two texts, *La Destruction de Rome* and the *Chanson de Fierabras* form part of a 'literary diptych', a so-called 'Geste de Fierabras'. Consequently, the volume is less concerned with the more general use of the *Chanson de Fierabras* in the French manuscript tradition.

By contrast, the two other divisions comprise only one manuscript each. The first manuscript contains distinctive, abbreviated versions of *La Destruction de Rome* and the *Chanson de Fierabras*, written in the Anglo-Norman dialect⁸⁰. The second manuscript hails from the South of France and contains an unabbreviated text of the *Chanson de Fierabras* in the Occitan dialect, which is combined with an Occitan *La Destruction de Rome* to form one continuous text⁸¹.

A complete list of the manuscripts containing the *Chanson de Fierabras* occurs in Appendix One at the end of this project⁸². A review at this stage will identify what can be inferred about the use of the *Chanson de Fierabras* from the historical distribution of the extant manuscripts. The majority of the manuscripts date from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, a period when the Sainte-Chapelle was still in its infancy and when the concept of the crusades was still very much alive. However, some of these manuscripts have certain distinguishing characteristics which are instructive for current purposes.

There are five extant manuscripts of the unabbreviated *Chanson de Fierabras* dating from the thirteenth century. Where an area of writing can be determined, these manuscripts appear to have been written in the styles of the North-East of France and England. In the one manuscript containing the complete text, the Anglo-Norman manuscript MS. Anc. Louvain, Bib. de l'Université, G 171 dated 1240-1300, the *Chanson de Fierabras* follows *Boeue de Hamtun*⁸³. Here, an important 'Matter of France' text concerning Charlemagne and the Saracens is placed next to a text from Norman England which relates the quest of a local hero, at times in the face of

⁸⁰ed.L.Brandin in *Romania* 64, 1938, pp.18-100.

⁸¹ed.G.Reimer, Berlin, 1830.

⁸²Appendix One, in which the list of de Mandach is re-ordered into a chronological list of the manuscripts of each version of the story; de Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.168-86.

⁸³*id.*, p.171.

Saracen adversity. The English hero Bevis is thus compared favourably with Charlemagne himself.

From the fourteenth century, there are also five manuscripts. Three of the manuscripts contain the complete text. In the Anglo-Norman manuscript, MS. Hannover, Niedersächsische Staatsbibliothek, IV. 578, a copy of the *Chanson de Fierabras* has been added in the early fourteenth century to a thirteenth-century copy of *La Destruction de Rome*⁸⁴. In the two manuscripts from Northern France, MS. Vatican, Regina Christina 1616 (written at St. Brieuc in 1317) and the Picard MS. Paris, B.N. fr.12603., the *Chanson de Fierabras* is followed by another chanson de geste concerning Charlemagne: in the former, it is the *Chanson d'Otinel*⁸⁵, the chanson de geste which gave rise to the earlier group of English Charlemagne romances; in the latter, it is *Ogier de Danemarche*⁸⁶, which gives prominence to the character who kills the Saracen Admiral in the *Chanson de Fierabras*.

There are two manuscripts dating from the middle of the fifteenth century, both of which contain the complete text. The first is MS. B.L. Royal 15 E VI, which was commissioned by John Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, in 1444 for the marriage of Marguerite of Anjou to Henry VI of England⁸⁷, the king who had also been crowned King of France in 1431. The manuscript was probably written at Mons by Jean Wauquelin, who was chiefly patronised by the Duke of Burgundy⁸⁸. It also contains a copy of the *Chanson d'Aspremont*, which shows how an Englishman considered these 'Matter of France' texts to be suitable material for a gift to honour the marriage of the

⁸⁴id., pp.169 & 174.

⁸⁵id., p.172.

⁸⁶id., p.185.

⁸⁷id., p.171.

⁸⁸See references in G.Doutrepont, *Les Mises en Prose des Épopées et des Romans Chevaleresques du XIV au XVI Siècle*, Geneva, 1969, pp.414-66.

King of England to a royal French bride⁸⁹, at a time when the war between the two countries over the crown of France was drawing to a close. The second manuscript is the Burgundian MS. Paris, B.N. fr.1499, written between 1450 and 1465⁹⁰, which shows an interest in Burgundy in the story that will be seen in the next section to have featured prominently in the Burgundian literary circles during this period.

The Occitanian text is preserved in MS. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Gall. Oct. 41, dated by script to just before the middle of the thirteenth century⁹¹. The text fuses *La Destruction de Rome* and the *Chanson de Fierabras* into one narrative account, showing that both these stories were known in the South of France during the thirteenth century. Indeed, they would have had a special pointedness during the time of the Albigensian crusade (started 1209) against the Occitanian Cathars⁹². The Catharist heresy had led to the region being divorced from Rome. The Albigensian Crusade against the Cathars not only rid France of the non-Catholic Christian church, but it also provided an opportunity for the King of France to extend his effective power into that region. A text displaying the unity of France within the framework of the history of the most important Relics owned by the Catholic church could have been very useful for propaganda purposes⁹³.

The abbreviated Anglo-Norman version of the *Chanson de Fierabras* is preserved in MS. B.L. Egerton 3028⁹⁴. Dated to the middle of the fourteenth century, this manuscript contains a brief version of *La Destruction de Rome* followed by a brief

⁸⁹Discussed in detail by A. de Mandach, 'A Royal Wedding-Present in the Making: Talbot's Chivalric Anthology (Royal 15 E VI) for Queen Margaret of Anjou, and the Laval-Middleton Anthology of Nottingham' in *Nottingham Mediaeval Studies* 18, 1974, pp.56-76.

⁹⁰de Mandach, *op.cit.*, p.174.

⁹¹de Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.169 & 171.

⁹²The Albigensian crusade is described by F.L.Cheyette in 'Cathars', J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.3, New York, 1983, pp.188-9; in detail by J.R.Strayer, *The Albigensian Crusade*, New York, 1971; id., p.169 discusses the decline of Occitan in favour of Parisian French in the Languedoc following the Albigensian Crusade.

⁹³Suggested by de Mandach, *op.cit.*, p.169.

⁹⁴id., p.170.

version of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. This Anglo-Norman version would have demonstrated how all the French-speaking world was required to lead the vanguard of Christians against the forces of Islam. From the Anglo-Norman perspective, the most important function of the text would be its description of the destruction of Rome and the zeal and heroism of a great Roman emperor, which led to the rescue of the Relics of the Passion themselves, by then preserved in the glorious setting of the Sainte-Chapelle.

This review of the manuscripts shows that although *La Destruction de Rome* acted as a preface to the *Chanson de Fierabras* by providing a more circumstantial account of the Saracen sack of the Papal city, it is only the thirteenth-century Occitan manuscript and the fourteenth-century manuscripts from Anglo-Norman England that contain the two texts together. In manuscripts written in Northern France, the *Chanson de Fierabras* is generally placed next to a further poem concerning the deeds of Charlemagne. The French patrons felt it more appropriate to combine the story of the Relics of the Passion with another display of French unity and valour under the emperor. This interpretation finds an English echo in the thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman manuscript, in which a romance about an English hero is associated with its copy of the *Chanson de Fierabras*.

Résumé

Although the date of composition of the *Chanson de Fierabras* is uncertain, it has been plausibly suggested that it was originally composed, like the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....* to demonstrate the primacy of St. Denis over other French ecclesiastical institutions by claiming to own certain Relics of the Passion, including the Crown of Thorns, which were being preserved there as a result of the actions of Charlemagne against the Saracens. However, the text enjoyed a new and greater

ideological potency, during and following the reign of Louis IX and the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle, as an account of the transfer of the Relics of the Passion to Paris itself within a framework which justified and promoted the crusades against the Saracens. Twelve thirteenth and fourteenth-century manuscripts containing the *chanson de geste* in French, Occitan and Anglo-Norman, illustrate the relative popularity of the story at this time.

In the manuscript tradition of Northern France, the cultivation of the *Chanson de Fierabras* and other *chansons de geste* had a patriotic or nationalistic side which cannot be divorced from the thirteenth-century expansion of Capetian and Angevin influence in Southern Europe. During the reign of Louis IX, Charles of Anjou was installed as King of Sicily. The *chansons de geste* could illustrate that Louis IX was using Charlemagne as a role model. By contrast, the factual account of the transference of the Relics of the Passion from Rome to Paris suited the needs of the thirteenth-century Occitanian and fourteenth-century Anglo-Norman patrons. A complete 'history' might have had ideological force against the Catharist heresy, insofar as it laid importance on both a united church and a united France. To the Anglo-Normans, the history could show how the exemplary Christian emperor had led the faithful and saved the Relics of the Passion, with a display of ideals that should be followed by all Christian kings.

The latest copy of *La Destruction de Rome* and the *Chanson de Fierabras* in England is the Anglo-Norman version, written around the time of the outbreak of war between England and France over the crown of France. A text showing how France came to be the place where the Relics of the Passion were kept could have become useful propaganda for the French. However, from around the start to near the end of the war, there is a complete dearth of manuscripts, rendering a study of the use of the *Chanson de Fierabras* in that turbulent period impossible. Nevertheless, when the flow of

manuscripts restarts in the middle of the fifteenth century, the manuscripts have Burgundian and English patronages, showing the interest in the Fierabras story away from the Île de France. Indeed, it was in these regions, as in Ireland, that the *chanson de geste* was adapted and translated into derivative versions of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, a discussion of which forms the basis of the next section.

SECTION TWO**THE LATER MEDIEVAL DERIVATIVES OF THE
CHANSON DE FIERABRAS IN FRANCE, ENGLAND
AND IRELAND**

In addition to a relatively large number of manuscripts of the *Chanson de Fierabras* itself, the Fierabras story has survived in a number of adaptations into French prose and translations into other languages from the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries¹. Additionally, there are a number of early printed editions and translations of one French prose adaptation, dating from the last quarter of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. This wealth of extant evidence testifies to the popularity of the Fierabras story, as told in the *Chanson de Fierabras*, in the areas in which it was known.

The reasons for the popularity of the *Chanson de Fierabras* in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries have been explained by reference to the contemporary events surrounding the Relics of the Passion. The popularity of the story in the politically volatile arena of late fourteenth and early fifteenth-century France, England and Ireland needs more consideration². Although two fifteenth-century copies of the *Chanson de Fierabras* are extant, considerably more manuscripts contain copies of the derivative texts. An understanding of the reasons for the proliferation of copies of the Fierabras story in the fifteenth century is clearly a desideratum. A survey of these

¹The most complete list of all the daughter versions is provided by A. de Mandach in *Naissance et Développement de la Chanson de Geste en Europe* vol.5, Geneva, 1987, pp.165-7.

²The description 'politically volatile' refers to a number of events in France and the British Isles including the Hundred Years' War between France and England, the Burgundian/Armagnac Civil War in France, the Gaelic Revival in Ireland, the Great Schism in the Church between Rome and Avignon, the War between Scotland and England in the early fourteenth century, the English Wars of the Roses. General studies of this period include M.McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century, 1307-1399*, Oxford History of England, Oxford, 1959; E.F.Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485*, Oxford History of England, Oxford, 1961; P.S.Lewis, *Later Medieval France: the Polity*, London & New York, 1968; E.Perroy, *The Hundred Years War*, trans.W.B.Wells, London, 1951; and A.Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, Oxford, 1987. The principal details are included in short overviews including, importantly, J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 12 vols., New York, 1982-9.

texts will also show how both *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the Irish *Sdair Fortibrais* fit into the wider pattern of Fierabras literature in Europe.

French and English Derivatives

French Prose Adaptations³

Three French prose adaptations of the *Chanson de Fierabras* are extant, dating from different times in the fifteenth century. They differ in character, and together with the two fifteenth-century copies of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, show how variously the story was treated during the course of that century.

*Roman de Fierabras*⁴

This first French prose adaptation is preserved in two manuscripts dated respectively to 1410 and 1460⁵. The text was probably written around 1400, shortly before the earlier of the surviving copies, in the North-East of France⁶. The adapter prefixed a brief précis of *La Destruction de Rome* and certain other material to the *Chanson de Fierabras*⁷, which gives the text a more historical flavour. It is a nice example of the adaptation of a French verse epic into prose to meet the needs of an expanding market for more factual and less romantic literature.

One major feature of this adaptation is that the Sainte-Chapelle is mentioned by name. The author has updated his account by declaring the Relics of the Passion are

³G.Doutrepont, *Les Mises en Prose des Épopées et des Romans Chevaleresques du XIV au XVI Siècle*, Brussels, 1939, pp.70-1 & 89-102 discusses the texts of the three French prose adaptations.

⁴ed.J.Miquet, Montréal, 1984.

⁵id., p.20.

⁶id., p.29.

⁷id., pp.55-58, §1-9 - the 'Prologue' to the text.

in the chapel⁸, having been at St. Denis only temporarily. This account of the history of the Relics of the Passion was clearly being used in the fifteenth century to enhance the standing of the Sainte-Chapelle itself.

If it is correct to accept a date of around 1400 for its composition, this adaptation was written during the period of the Great Schism⁹. This account could be seen as justifying the movement of the centre of Western Christendom from Italy to France. Although Paris is not Avignon, the text dwells upon the transfer of the Relics of the Passion from Rome, which had become too vulnerable to Saracen attacks, to France. Although the text is also concerned with Christian unity in the face of invading forces, so that the rift in the Christian camp, shown in the quarrel between Charlemagne and Roland, is soon healed, Paris is unmistakably given a position as a modern day Rome¹⁰.

On a more secular plane, the adaptation could also be seen as referring to the French Civil War between the supporters of the Duke of Burgundy (Burgundians) and those of the Duke of Orléans (Armagnacs)¹¹. At one level, the text seems to advocate the unity of France, suggesting that French dukes should be waging war against an invading force, and not quarrelling with each other. However, it does make a feature

⁸id., p.177, §303-4.

⁹The main part of Great Schism lasted from 1378 until 1409, when the Council of Pisa deposed both rival popes and elected a new one. Both deposed popes continued to have support until the election of Martin V at the Council of Constance in 1417. France officially supported the Avignon pope until 1409, but it was under French pressure that the Council of Pisa was convened. Discussed briefly by H.Kaminsky, 'Shism, Great' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.38-42; in detail by É.Delaruelle, *L'Église au Temps du Grand Schisme et de la Crise Conciliaire (1378-1449)*, 2 vols, Paris, 1962-4.

¹⁰Applicable to the situation after 1409 - the end of the major part of the Schism, as a result of a French initiative.

¹¹This civil war lasted officially from the death of the Duke of Orléans in 1407 until the Treaty of Arras in 1435. However, the roots of the quarrel between the Dukes of Burgundy and Orléans for influence at the French court can be seen developing in the last decade of the fourteenth century. Described by J.B.Henneman, 'France: 1314-1494' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.187-8.

of the Dukes of Burgundy and Normandy, that might suggest a bias towards the Burgundian camp during the civil war¹².

Although these political readings are suggestive, they must remain somewhat speculative. It is only the history of the Relics of the Passion which is guaranteed to have been comprehended by the reader. Thus, although this version was copied in the middle of the century, shortly after the compilation of chansons de geste by John Talbot for Henry VI of England, it was not chosen for inclusion in that sort of compilation: for here the history of the Relics was a major point of interest.

Chroniques et Conquêtes de Charlemagne of David Aubert¹³

This text was finished in 1458 by David Aubert¹⁴ and was dedicated to Duke Philip 'the Good' of Burgundy¹⁵. It is contained in only one manuscript, presumed to be written by Aubert himself¹⁶. The complete text is a compendium consisting chiefly of prose adaptations of a number of chansons de geste¹⁷, providing a complete history of the wars of Charlemagne against the pagans. This is the most complete example of a large-scale prose compilation based on the deeds of Charlemagne.

The work is presented in two volumes, the adaptation of the *Chanson de Fierabras* occupying a prominent position at the start of the second volume¹⁸. The second volume starts with the prologue dedicating the text to Philip the Good. Then there is a very short redaction of *La Destruction de Rome*¹⁹, which prefaces the adaptation of

¹²id., p.187. The Burgundian faction enjoyed popularity in Paris in the early years of the civil war, with the Armagnac faction being considered in Northern France as "brutal Gascon troops".

¹³ed.R.Guette, 3 vols., Brussels, 1940. The whole text is discussed in G.Doutrepont, *op.cit.*, pp.63-86.

¹⁴Guette, *op.cit.*, vol.1, p.1.

¹⁵id., vol.2.1, p.16. The author's prologue to the second volume contains this dedication.

¹⁶Doutrepont, *op.cit.*, pp.65-6.

¹⁷id., pp.66-73. List of the chansons de geste utilised.

¹⁸Guette, *op.cit.*, vol.2.1, pp.20-100.

¹⁹id., pp.17-20.

the Fierabras story. This adaptation is followed by adaptations of *Quatre Fils Aymon* and versions of the stories contained within the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*.

This compilation was most likely made in response to the announcement of the crusades planned by Philip the Good, most notably that of 1454²⁰. Philip appears to have used Charlemagne as his role model, and aspired to follow in his footsteps. A compilation of the stories of Charlemagne, as achieved to a more limited extent in the French manuscripts of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, could provide an excellent vehicle for the promotion of the qualities of valour and Christian unity against the Saracens.

The Fierabras adaptation would have been of the utmost importance to this scheme. As in the earlier prose adaptation, the Sainte-Chapelle is named as the resting place of the Relics²¹. It was because Frenchmen had once regained the most precious Christian objects from the Saracens, and moved them to Paris, that France, of which Burgundy was the wealthiest and most influential region in the mid-fifteenth century, had become a major centre of Christendom.

Also, Guy of Burgundy is an important figure in the *Chanson de Fierabras*, in which he epitomises Christian love and spirit. It is love for Guy that causes Floripes to become a Christian and to betray the Saracens, and following their marriage Guy is awarded half the Saracen lands²². The figure of Guy offers a role model to which Philip's Burgundian followers could aspire.

²⁰R. Vaughan, *Philip the Good: The Apogee of Burgundy*, Cambridge, Mass., 1970, pp.358-66; the role of Aubert at the Burgundian court is mentioned pp.156-7.

²¹Discussed by de Mandach, *op.cit.*, p.125.

²²Guiette, *op.cit.*, p.99.

This adaptation of the *Chanson de Fierabras* was written by the Vaudois Savoyard Jehan Bagnyon in 1478 at Lausanne in Switzerland²⁴, and survives in two manuscripts from that period²⁵. The *Chanson de Fierabras* is the centrepiece of the text. It is preceded by a brief history of the Catholic kings of France, and an adaptation of the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus*..... . It is followed by an adaptation of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*. Both this prologue and epilogue were taken from the thirteenth-century *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais²⁶, which suggests that the text was intended primarily as a historical document. The author tells us that the text was written for one Henri Bolomier, a canon of Geneva, thus confirming its status as a church text²⁷.

The prologue explains how Charlemagne came to be King of France, and how he transferred the Relics of the Passion to Aachen. The *Chanson de Fierabras* adaptation explains how the Relics had to be recaptured from the Saracens in Spain and then were taken to Paris, where they now rest. The epilogue then explains how Spain was completely conquered by Charlemagne²⁸. Thus, two of the principal themes of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, the rescue of the Relics and the recapture of Spain, are extended in this compilation with the help of a Latin prose history. The effect is to impart historical authority to the Fierabras story. The destruction of Rome, which had usually figured as a prologue to the Fierabras story, is here superseded by an account of the Relics, which gives a clear enough indication of the purpose of the text.

²³There is no modern edition of this text. Described by G.Doutrepont, *op.cit.*, pp.94-6. Also the subject of a discussion by de Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.147-62.

²⁴*id.*, pp.147 & 150-3;

²⁵*id.* p.174.

²⁶*id.*, p.148.

²⁷*id.*, p.151.

²⁸*id.*, p.148, with reference to the original stories themselves.

One of the reasons for the composition of Bagnyon's text may be deduced from its reference to the Holy Shroud as one of the Relics²⁹. From 1453, the Shroud had been the property of the Dukes of Savoy, in whose domain this compilation was made³⁰. Linking the Shroud with the other Relics of the Passion would have suggested that it deserved the same rank as those Relics kept in the Sainte-Chapelle, and that Savoy could vie with Paris as a centre of Christian leadership.

It would also be possible to see this text as reflecting Savoyard and Swiss politics. Duke Charles of Burgundy had become protector of Savoy, an ancient part of the Kingdom of Burgundy, in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. In 1475 the Swiss confederates, allied with the Habsburgs, invaded Vaud, the region of Jean Bagnyon, and inflicted two defeats upon the Duke of Burgundy³¹. Bagnyon's text clearly displays a special interest in the Duke of Burgundy, and shows a bias towards his camp. Conceivably, the Swiss forces could be seen as a parallel to the invading Saracens. However, the primary message of the text could equally be that the French-speaking world should unite to fight its common enemies.

This text had an important consequence. Between 1478 and the end of the century, a number of printed editions were produced³², satisfying an emergent French market for literature concerning Charlemagne, Spain and the Relics of the Passion. It was in this printed form that the text was obtained by William Caxton for translation and printing into English (see below)³³.

²⁹id., p.152

³⁰id., pp.152-3, esp. n. 233.

³¹Described by J.Y.Mariotte, 'Switzerland' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.544-5. French-speaking Switzerland depended upon Savoy for support. Charles of Burgundy had become allied with the Habsburgs, and Savoy under Habsburg control represented a severe threat to Swiss independence. The initial alliance of the Swiss was with Louis XI of France, with whom Charles of Burgundy was trying to limit contacts. However, "the brutality of the Burgundians" saw a union between Habsburg and Switzerland.

³²de Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.174-7.

³³id., p.178.

Summary

At a literal level the French prose adaptations agree in providing a history of the removal of the Relics of the Passion to Paris, following the defeat of the Saracens by Charlemagne. They all show Paris as a centre of Christendom, and provide, in effect, an origin legend for the Sainte-Chapelle. Political interpretations are more speculative, but it is noticeable that a convenient political explanation can always be found to fit the story. With each text, one can find an interpretation that exalts the Duke of Burgundy, although it is only in the work of David Aubert that this is particularly blatant. Wider political readings are even more speculative, although the need to submerge differences for the unity of France is a theme that could be applicable throughout the fifteenth century³⁴.

English Translations of the *Chanson de Fierabras*³⁵

There are four English translations of the Fierabras story, dating from the third quarter of the fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century³⁶. Three are verse romance-style translations, based on versions of the *Chanson de Fierabras* itself. The fourth translation is a prose translation of the printed version of Bagnyon's French prose adaptation.

³⁴The unity of France was effectively achieved by King Louis XI with the absorption of a number of duchies into the royal domain. Outlined by J.B.Henneman, 'Louis XI of France' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.7, New York, 1986, p.676.

³⁵H.M.Smyser, 'Charlemagne Legends' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, pp.81-7 contains a description of all the English Fierabras translations.

³⁶*id.*, pp.14-5 for a chronological list of the English romances showing the position of the Fierabras story. Relations between the various English Fierabras romances are noted by M.Konick, 'The Authorship of *Sir Ferumbras*', diss. U.Pennsylvania, 1953. (Dissertation Abstracts, Ann Arbor, vol.13, p.233, no. 4940.)

The text is a fairly close verse translation of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, although the first and last portions of the text are missing³⁸. It is preserved in one manuscript dating from the third quarter of the fourteenth century, and the linguistic forms suggest the date of the text is the same as that of the manuscript. These linguistic forms also suggest the translation was made by a speaker who used south-western dialectal forms³⁹. Non-linguistic evidence suggests that the translator was a cleric working in the diocese of Exeter⁴⁰.

Assuming a clerical authorship, the movement of Relics of the Passion from Rome to the Sainte-Chapelle and the justification of the crusading ideal would seem to be important motivations behind the translation of this story. As has been noticed earlier, the *Chanson de Fierabras* story replaced the *Chanson d'Otinél* as the popular source text for the story of Charlemagne and the Saracens in English during the late fourteenth century. This text is a reasonably close verse translation, and thus appears as an aristocratic romance, rather than a factual historical account⁴¹. The unique manuscript suggests that this translation did not enjoy a wide circulation⁴².

If one asks how this story could have been interpreted by a reader during the later fourteenth century, the political 'signals' are hard to read with certainty. The text is decidedly pro-French, and it was written at a time when there was considerable

³⁷ed.S.J.Herrtage, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.34, London, 1879. Described by Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.84-6.

³⁸*id.*, p.84. The text is discussed in detail by Konick, *op.cit.*, who attempts to explain why the metre of the poem changes at a point close to the middle of the text by postulating two different source traditions, which he calls 'abbreviating' (similar to the Anglo-Norman versions of the text) and 'non-abbreviating' (like the Old French *Chanson de Fierabras*).

³⁹Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.85. This information is derived from Herrtage, *op.cit.*, pp.xiv-xix.

⁴⁰*id.*, pp.xv-xvi. It is noted how the manuscript is bound by two documents concerning this diocese.

⁴¹i.e. the text would have been viewed in a similar manner to the original *chanson de geste*, and not to the prose adaptations.

⁴²In this respect, *Sir Ferumbras* can be likened to the prose adaptations.

political tension between France and England over the question of who was the true king of France⁴³. Conceivably, one is meant to see Charlemagne's seizure of the Crown of Thorns as pre-figuring the English king's seizure of the crown of France. On that reading, the Fierabras story could have been especially apt between the English victories of Crecy (1346) and Poitiers (1356), and the proposed coronation of Edward III at Rheims.

Conversely, if the text could be dated to the last decades of the century, the villain of the text could be the King of England, where oppression came in the form of excessive taxation levied to support the war against the Valois kings⁴⁴. However, it is hard to see how any English patron of literature would have wished to be overly supportive of the Valois kings at this time. This unique manuscript may represent a lone voice of dissent, but the motivation is hard to discern in a South-Western English context.

As it happens, there is a very good example of how the Fierabras story could be used for anti-English purposes. John Barbour, in his *Bruce* (written 1375-7)⁴⁵, has Bruce recite the story of Fierabras to his army before the battle of Bannockburn⁴⁶. In this context the Scottish army equates with the French, and the English army with the Saracens. Barbour's comparison is obvious: his story is one in which the invaded

⁴³In 1356, Edward the Black Prince had gained victory at Poitiers, leading to the failed attempts of his father, Edward III, to be crowned King of France at Rheims in 1359. The peace of Brétigny in 1360 saw a relatively peaceful decade until 1369, when the English magnates started to lead raids across France. However, the military forces of Charles V drove the English back to Bordeaux and Calais, with a general cessation of warfare after 1380. Events described by M.R.Powicke, 'Hundred Years' War' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.6, New York, 1985, p.332. Also listed chronologically by K.Fowler, *The Age of Plantagenet and Valois*, London, 1967, p.10.

⁴⁴These 'poll taxes' commenced in 1377. See M.Kowaleski, 'Poll Tax, English' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.10, New York, 1988, p.26.

⁴⁵ed.W.W.Skeat, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.11, 21, 29, 55, London, 1870-89. Described by E.D.Kennedy, 'Chronicles of Scottish History' in A.E.Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of Writings in Middle English*, New Haven, 1989, pp.2681-6.

⁴⁶J.Barbour, *Bruce*, ed.W.W.Skeat, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.55, London, 1889, bk. 3, 1.435-66. Noticed in relation to *Sir Ferumbras* by de Mandach, *op.cit.*, p.170.

defeat the invaders. However, considerations like these are not applicable to *Sir Ferumbras*.

It is perhaps more likely that, as with the *Chanson de Fierabras*, the main purpose of the text is to show how the Relics of the Passion were recaptured from the Saracens by a united Christian front. The quarrel between France and England could be represented by the conflict between Charlemagne and Roland, which resulted in a small spill of blood, but eventually led to a reconciliation. The story would on that analysis contain a broad Christian message. Of course, one could still ask who was 'Charlemagne' in an English source from the third quarter of the fourteenth century: Edward III would seem the most likely candidate.

*The Fillingham Firumbras*⁴⁷

The *Fillingham Firumbras*, although only a fragment, is an example of a translation of the *Fierabras* story from the last quarter of the fourteenth century. Written in the East Midland dialect, it is preserved in a single manuscript, the Fillingham manuscript, dating from the last quarter of the fifteenth century⁴⁸. It is noteworthy that this text was being copied in manuscript at the time when many romances were already being printed by Caxton.

In general, the text bears comparison with *Sir Ferumbras*. Even though there is no direct evidence for clerical authorship, the history of the Relics of the Passion and the Sainte-Chapelle would seem to have been the author's principal concern. However, any political nuances would have to be somewhat different on account of the later date of composition. For military activity between England and France ceased around

⁴⁷ed. M.I.O'Sullivan in *Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, Early English Text Society, vol.198, Oxford, 1935, pp.xv-xlii;1-58. Described by Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.86.

⁴⁸*ibid.*, deriving information from O'Sullivan, *op.cit.*, pp.xi-xv & xx.

1380, and peace was reinforced by the Truce of Leulingen in 1389⁴⁹, which prevented active hostilities for the last decade of the fourteenth century, though the English claim to the French throne continued.

One of the most interesting features of the manuscript containing the *Fillingham Firumbras* is that it is followed by a version of *Otuel and Roland*⁵⁰, which also contains material from the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*⁵¹. This is the only example in English of a species of compilation found quite regularly in the French manuscripts, in which the *Chanson de Fierabras* is coupled with another chanson de geste⁵². The culmination of this activity is to be seen in David Aubert's *Chroniques et Conquêtes de Charlemagne*.

As the Fillingham manuscript was compiled after the end of the war between France and England⁵³, post-war conditions must be assumed in any attempt to diagnose a political message in this Fierabras text. It is clear that the compiler of the manuscript united two English verse texts in the same way that Jean Bagnyon was uniting the *Chanson de Fierabras* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* in French prose. But whereas both texts dwell on the heroic activities of the French against the Saracens, the French prose text presents the account in a more historical manner, while the English verse presents the texts more in the epic style of the earlier French manuscripts, in which the advocacy of French unity was an important sub-theme.

⁴⁹Fowler, *op.cit.*, p.10.

⁵⁰ed.O'Sullivan, *op.cit.*, pp.59-146. Described by Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.88-92.

⁵¹*id.*, p.88. *Otuel and Roland* is cited as the second half of a once longer romance entitled **Charlemagne and Roland*, of which the first half is extant in the romance *Roland and Vernagu*. Apart from the Otinel story, all the material is drawn from the *Redacted Johannis Turpin*.

⁵²Especially MS. Vatican Regina Christiana 1616, where the *Chanson de Fierabras* is followed by the *Roman d'Otinél*.

⁵³Following the conquest by Charles VII of Normandy in 1450 and the fall of Bordeaux in 1453.

In late fifteenth-century England, this could have had an application in the context of the Wars of the Roses and the subsequent rise of the Tudor dynasty⁵⁴. In that case, the striving for English national unity would be the 'sous entendu' implied by the France of Charlemagne. The reuniting of England after Henry Tudor's 'rescue' of the royal Crown which had been stolen from his Lancastrian predecessors by the Yorkist faction is the most obvious analogy in this period.

*The Sowdon of Babylon*⁵⁵

The *Sowdon of Babylon* is a highly condensed combination of *La Destruction de Rome* and the *Chanson de Fierabras*, seemingly based on the Anglo-Norman versions of *La Destruction de Rome* and the *Chanson de Fierabras* described earlier⁵⁶. It is preserved in a single manuscript, which has been dated to the mid-fifteenth century; the text shows signs of having been written in the East Midlands during the first half of the fifteenth century⁵⁷.

This text shows an interesting link with the somewhat earlier Anglo-Norman tradition. It has *La Destruction de Rome* as its prologue⁵⁸, giving the text a historical flavour, but without the Paris-centred emphasis found in the French texts discussed above. The medium of verse for this type of literary fusion is continued, as in the *Chroniques Rimées* of Philippe Mousket.

The text is slightly but significantly later than *Sir Ferumbras* and the *Fillingham Firumbras*, a factor to be weighed in any political interpretation of the text. For it was

⁵⁴See P.Saccio, 'Wars of the Roses' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.569-73.

⁵⁵ed.E.Hausknecht, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.38, London, 1881. Described by Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.82-4.

⁵⁶*id.*, p.84, the Anglo-Norman versions being preserved in MS. B.L.Egerton 3028. The relationship is best discussed by de Mandach, *op.cit.*, Ch.2, pp.7-24.

⁵⁷Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, 82, based on Hausknecht, *op.cit.*, pp.xlv-xlvi.

⁵⁸*id.*, pp.1-30. The *Fierabras* story runs from pp.30-94.

in the first half of the fifteenth century that English power in France reached its zenith, especially in the period between the victory of Henry V at Agincourt in 1415⁵⁹, the subsequent alliance of England and Burgundy in 1419⁶⁰, and the coronation of Henry VI in Paris in 1431⁶¹. At that time, if ever, the King of England could claim that his line and rule were the natural successors to the Capetian kings of France, and proper guardians of the Crown of Thorns. There would be no reason not to portray France in time of Charlemagne as prefiguring the rule of the Plantagenet Kings.

There is no evidence that the text attained any popularity. The surviving copy was written at a time when the power of Henry VI in France had already collapsed following the Treaty of Arras in 1435 that reconciled Charles VII and Philip the Good⁶². If it were read as a text that championed France, its lack of appeal would require no explanation. It, however, it could be read in the light of continuing English aspirations to rule France, a text such as the *Sowdon of Babylon* could perhaps have been seen as promoting the somewhat flagging concept of the unity of the crowns.

Charles the Great by William Caxton⁶³

This text is a very close English translation of the *Fierabras* of Jean Bagnyon, made by William Caxton. The English edition was brought out by Caxton in 1485 at Westminster⁶⁴, following the appearance of the Bagnyon's text in printed form. The publication of Caxton's text enabled the story of Fierabras, which was combined with the prologue of *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....* and the epilogue of the

⁵⁹Fowler, pp.10, 79-80, 149-50.

⁶⁰*id.*, pp.10 & 80. Alliance resulting from the assassination of Duke John the Fearless.

⁶¹*id.*, p.179.

⁶²*id.*, pp.10,171.

⁶³ed.S.J.Herrtage, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.36-7, London, 1880-1. Described by Smyser in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.86-7.

⁶⁴*id.*, p.86, based to some extent on Herrtage, *op.cit.*, pp.v-ii.

Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle, to reach a wider audience. Its success shows that there was a demand for Charlemagne literature in England in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, just as there was in France.

The appearance of this publication shows that the history of the Relics of the Passion was still of interest. The 'historical' slant of Bagnyon's text was well suited to the tastes of the wider readership for which the medium of print served and catered. As the text was translated after the interests of the King of England in France had effectively come to an end, political advocacy (other than the most general notion of Christendom uniting to fight the forces of paganism) is unlikely to have been present. There is little to suggest that the text was translated, say, to promote the cause of the Burgundians against the Swiss. However, what has been said before with respect to the Fillingham manuscript is also applicable to this text. The concept of the unity of England under Henry VII at the end of the Wars of the Roses could perhaps be represented by Charlemagne and his peers. Such a theme would have gained additional point at the time of the attempts of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck to usurp the throne⁶⁵.

Caxton's *Charles the Great* is not the only composite text involving the Fierabras story: this feature has been seen in the Fillingham manuscript. Caxton may have sensed that the story of Charlemagne's struggles against the Saracens was capable of gaining popularity in England, as it was doing in France. At all events, the printing of *Charles the Great* gave the story its biggest possible promotion.

⁶⁵For these usurpation attempts, see S.B.Chrimes, *Henry VII*, London, 1972, pp.69-73.

Summary

The pattern of English translation of the *Chanson de Fierabras* is similar to that of the French prose adaptations. There are similar numbers of texts, distributed over a similar time scale, and a printed edition is the end result in each case. With both sets of texts, an important motive for translation or adaptation was to tell the story of the Relics of the Passion. However, it is also possible to discern political loading in some if not all cases. The unity of France is clearly an important theme in such interpretations as may be suggested. In the case of the English translations one has to read the texts mindful that the Kings of England claimed to be Kings of France as well. The success that sprang from unity during the time of Charlemagne is the key to any 'political' reading of these translations. However, it must be noted that the number of 'Matter of France' texts involved is limited by comparison with the number of 'Matter of Britain' texts, which were the natural and obvious vehicles for statements about English unity.

The Irish Tradition - the Latin *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the Irish *Sdair Fortibrais*

At this stage it is appropriate to turn to the Irish tradition of the Fierabras story, which presents two striking features. First, the Fierabras story in Irish depends upon an otherwise unknown Latin prose translation of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. Second, the sheer number of extant copies of the Irish translation exceeds that of any other manuscript derivative of the chanson de geste. These features suggest that the literary tradition in Ireland need not mirror the French or English conditions in all respects.

It is proposed that this Latin translation of the *Chanson de Fierabras* was the work of an Irishman, or at least of a translator interested in taking the Fierabras story to Ireland, for the following reasons. First, the Latin text is uniquely preserved in an Irish manuscript⁶⁶. Second, the only other representatives of this version of the Fierabras story are the copies of the Irish translation *Sdair Fortibrais*, which derives from it alone. Additionally, if the Latin translation had been made for a wider audience than Ireland, a healthier survival rate might have been expected for the text itself, and a wider scatter of translations based on it⁶⁷.

One of the puzzling features about the text is the date at which it was translated. In the absence of direct evidence, dates ante quem and post quem can be established by the following criteria: the translation must have been made prior to the first appearance of *Sdair Fortibrais* in a datable manuscript, which is 1437⁶⁸; also, the text is most likely to have been translated after the completion of the Sainte-Chapelle in 1248⁶⁹.

In order to arrive at a somewhat more precise date for the translation, certain external factors can be taken into consideration. Assuming the text to be the work of an Irishman, it may be suggested that it is most likely to have been written at a time when there a considerable number of other Latin texts was being written by Irish authors. This suggestion would be unhelpful if there was no particular period during the later Middle Ages in which significantly more Hiberno-Latin texts were written

⁶⁶T.C.D.MS.667. Catalogued recently by M.Colker, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin*, vol.2, Scholar Press, Aldershot, 1991, pp.1123-64.

⁶⁷Compare the late thirteenth-century Latin prose translation of the *Roman de Troie* by Guido del Colonne. N.E.Griffin (ed.), *Historia Destructionis Troiae*, Cambridge, Mass., 1936, p.xi, notes 136 manuscripts and suggests there are more extant. As aforementioned this text was used as the basic source material for the majority of the English Troy romances (See R.M.Lumiansky, 'Legends of Troy' in J.Burke Severs (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.114-8).

⁶⁸Liber Flavus Fergusiorum, R.I.A. MS. 23 O 48.

⁶⁹L.Grodecki, *Sainte-Chapelle*, Paris, 196? (date missing from volume), p.14.

than at other times. However, the chronological distribution of such texts is not even. Almost all the non-hagiographic writing in Latin which can be ascribed to Irishmen from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries took place during one period, that is the early fourteenth century⁷⁰. Indeed, one of the best known Hiberno-Latin texts written at this time, the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis⁷¹, describes a pilgrimage via Paris and the Sainte-Chapelle to Jerusalem, via Saracen-ruled Egypt, thus showing that the subjects of *Gesta Karoli Magni* were not unique to that text in the Irish tradition. This would indicate, fairly strongly, that *Gesta Karoli Magni* is most likely to have been translated during the early fourteenth century⁷².

The early fourteenth century is an appropriate date for the following additional reasons. First, a good number of the manuscripts containing the *Chanson de Fierabras* were written at that time⁷³. Second, the unique manuscript containing the Anglo-Norman version of the text⁷⁴, the distinctive version of the *Chanson de Fierabras* written closest to Ireland geographically, was written at that time. Third, the translation of the *Roman de Troie* into Latin prose by Guido del Colonne, which is the most influential example of 'reverse translation' from French verse into Latin prose, had been written shortly before then⁷⁵. Fourth, this period saw an upsurge of interest in learning in Ireland: witness, for example, the attempt, albeit unsuccessful, to establish the University of St. Patrick in Dublin⁷⁶.

⁷⁰A survey of the Hiberno-Latin texts from this period known to him was made by M.Esposito, 'A Bibliography of the Latin Writers of Mediaeval Ireland' in *Studies* 2, 1913, pp.495-521. He notes, including dubia, three writers each from the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, ten from the fourteenth century, of which seven are confidently dated to the early fourteenth century, and only one from the fifteenth century. Among the early fourteenth-century writers is Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh, the most prolific of the writers. However, not mentioned is Richard Ledrede, Bishop of Ossory 1317-61 who also left a corpus of Latin writings. The rapid decline in the number of writers of Hiberno-Latin in the fifteenth century, compared to the stronger representation in the early fourteenth century, suggests strongly that *Gesta Karoli Magni* would have hailed from earlier in the period 1248-1437 rather than later.

⁷¹ed.M.Esposito, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* vol.4, Dublin, 1960.

⁷²It will be asked in Chapter 5 if *Gesta Karoli Magni* could have been translated from the French by Simon Semeonis himself.

⁷³de Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.168-86.

⁷⁴*id.*, p.170.

⁷⁵Griffin, *op.cit.*, p.xi, cites 1287 as the date of translation of this text.

⁷⁶Discussed by F.McGrath S.J., *Education in Ancient and Medieval Ireland*, Dublin, 1979, pp.216-8.

It is also tempting to suggest that if Irish translators of the later fourteenth or fifteenth century had desired to translate the *Fierabras* story into Irish, they would most easily have come by an English source text. However, the 'Matter of France' appears to have been of particular interest to the ecclesiastics on account of its strongly 'Christian' subject matter⁷⁷. Possibly a Latin source would have been more easily accessible, or considered more acceptable for this story. In that case, the greater availability of English texts later on would be irrelevant and this translation could have been made as late as the fifteenth century. Nevertheless, it seems preferable to suppose that the translation was made when a good deal of Latin was being written in Ireland, and at a time when the *Chanson de Fierabras* was being widely copied. That said, it must be admitted that there is no warrant to be more precise than to state that *Gesta Karoli Magni* was translated from the French 'in or around the early fourteenth century'.

Gesta Karoli Magni does not appear to have been particularly popular⁷⁸. It is clear that the text was copied at least once during the mid-fifteenth century, but there is no other testimony to the existence of the text. Indeed, it may owe its preservation to an association with the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, nearby which it appears in the manuscript⁷⁹. This association is reminiscent of that founded in David Aubert's and Jean Bagnyon's French versions, and in William Caxton's English version, which might suggest a date later in the fifteenth century for the compilation of the manuscript⁸⁰. As the text is found in a Franciscan manuscript⁸¹, it is not impossible that an Irish Franciscan with access to the *Chanson de Fierabras* had been the

⁷⁷See Chapter One, Section One.

⁷⁸This is also true of the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis, which is also only extant in a single manuscript. Esposito, *op.cit.*, p.2.

⁷⁹To be discussed more fully in Part Two. Colker, *op.cit.*, pp.1107-9 shows *Gesta Karoli Magni* to run from pages 85-100 of the manuscript, and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* from pages 107-30.

⁸⁰*id.*, p.1132. The only date in the manuscript is 1455.

⁸¹R. Flower, *The Irish Tradition*, Oxford, 1947, 1927 lecture 'Ireland in Medieval Europe', pp.122-3.

original translator. However, there is no evidence as to who he may have been, or where he may have obtained his source material⁸².

If the text was of greatest significance to the clerics, then the Christian content of the text, that is the struggle to regain the Relics of the Passion, and the account of their transference to Paris, becomes central to the reading of the text. This would suggest an awareness, on the part of some Irishmen, of the reasons for the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle. Possibly the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni* wished to bring its legendary history to the attention of contemporary ecclesiastics in Ireland. That the Sainte-Chapelle had been visited by an Irishman is attested by Simon Semeonis, who describes it in some detail⁸³.

This possibility is strengthened by the following consideration. *Gesta Karoli Magni*, unlike any version of the Fierabras story in French or English, opens with Helena's discovery of the True Cross, and its removal, along with other Relics of the Passion, to a number of places including Rome⁸⁴. This prologue is a précis of the text *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, an Irish translation of which, as will be shown later, always precedes *Sdair Fortibrais*⁸⁵. One of the windows in the Sainte-Chapelle portrays the Relics of the Passion being handed over to the French king⁸⁶: in reality King Louis IX, although it could also be interpreted as Charlemagne. In addition, this window illustrates the discovery of the True Cross by Helena. Thus *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* is connected with the fate of the other Relics of the Passion in this window in the Sainte-Chapelle, just as it is in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. This parallel is a

⁸²Irish Franciscans travelling abroad to study are noted in McGrath, *op.cit.*, pp.174-8; also references to Irish Franciscans in France in the Middle Ages are given by C.Mooney O.F.M., *Irish Franciscans and France*, Dublin, 1960, pp.7-11. Includes a reference to Simon Semeonis, p.9.

⁸³Esposito, *op.cit.*, §7.

⁸⁴Page 85, column 1, §1.

⁸⁵Manuscript 667 also contains a copy of the Latin text of *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*; Colker, *op.cit.*, p.1102. *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* is MS.pp.68-71.

⁸⁶Grodecki, *op.cit.*, p.115. This window, the "First South Window" is described as the "Story of the Relics of the Passion".

striking one, and it is plausible to suggest that this is an indication of the proximate source of the tradition embodied in *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

At this point, it may be asked if any political interpretations could be applied to this text in the Irish context. If the fundamental interest of *Gesta Karoli Magni* was ecclesiastical, then the most important political 'message' was the efficacy of Christians uniting to defeat the Saracen forces. Nevertheless, non-ecclesiastical ways of reading the text can also be suggested.

If it is a correct calculation that *Gesta Karoli Magni* was most probably composed in the early fourteenth century, then it was written at a time when Ireland was dominated by the Anglo-Irish lords loyal to the Kings of England, and there was tension between them and the Gaelic Irish aristocracy. To the latter, the Anglo-Irish were invaders and usurpers⁸⁷. Thus *Gesta Karoli Magni* could have been taken by a Gaelic readership to represent the Anglo-Irish by the Saracens, while the Gaels, represented by the French, attempted to regain their sovereign rights and territories, represented by the Crown of Thorns. However, it is far from clear that *Gesta Karoli Magni* was meant to be read by Gaels or by Anglo-Irish; the example of Simon Semeonis shows that an Anglo-Irishman could write a text using similar subject matter⁸⁸. From an Anglo-Irish point of view, *Gesta Karoli Magni* could conceivably be read as championing the right of the English king to re-establish his authority over Ireland, given that the effective royal control over Ireland declined during the second quarter of the fourteenth century⁸⁹.

⁸⁷K. Simms, 'The Norman Invasions and the Gaelic Recovery' in R.F. Foster (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland*, Oxford, 1989, esp. pp. 54-82.

⁸⁸Esposito, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁸⁹Simms in R.F. Foster (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 82-6. Ireland, used as a source of revenue by the kings was governed more cheaply by the magnates.

If a more specific political scenario were to be sought from the early fourteenth century, one might consider the Bruce invasion, which caused considerable anguish to both Gael and Anglo-Irish between 1315 to 1318⁹⁰. Edward Bruce, attempting to wrest Ireland from English control, allied himself with Donal O'Neill and gained the support of the Irish of Connaught. Turning to *Gesta Karoli Magni*, one could make a comparison can be made between the Scots and the Saracens. In some Irish eyes, Edward Bruce's claim to the title of King of Ireland was stealing a crown⁹¹, as the Saracens stole the Crown of Thorns. The comparison is the same as that made by Barbour in his *Bruce*, where he has the English attempting to steal the Scottish crown. On that reading the unity of the French can be seen as suggesting that the people of Ireland should unite to fight this invasion. Since a number of the Gaelic Irish leaders supported Bruce, it is more likely that the text would have been of interest to an Anglo-Irish readership.

Summary

If a secular, political message relevant to Ireland can be read into the text, the most plausible reading would equate the King of England with Charlemagne, and the reward of virtue would be effective control of Ireland. The translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni* would then be an Anglo-Irishman. However, such political interpretations continue to be speculative. What is not speculative is that *Gesta Karoli Magni* was able to explain in Latin the history of the Relics of the Passion, for which the Sainte-Chapelle was constructed. This text provided an important addition to the corpus of ecclesiastical lore available in later medieval Ireland.

⁹⁰id., pp.83-4.

⁹¹id., p.83.

At some stage prior to 1437, the date of the earliest manuscript, *Gesta Karoli Magni* was translated into Early Modern Irish as *Sdair Fortibrais*⁹³. Although the text itself cannot be dated precisely, a date around 1400, the date assigned using historical and linguistic criteria to *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*⁹⁴, is also credible on linguistic grounds⁹⁵. Compared with the other translations and adaptations of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, it seems to have enjoyed a measure of popularity, if one can go by the number of manuscripts in which it is preserved. It is contained in eight manuscripts, of which those that have a specific date were written between 1437 and 1514⁹⁶. Where the beginning of text is preserved, *Sdair Fortibrais* is preceded by a copy of the Irish translation of *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*⁹⁷, a fact which testifies to the connection between the story of the True Cross and the other Relics of the Passion in the minds of the Irish copyists.

This relative popularity can be accounted for by the fact that *Sdair Fortibrais* is a translation of a Latin history, and not of a French or English poem. As the French translations of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* show⁹⁸, Latin was considered to be the medium of historical truth. That this text was viewed in that light is suggested by the manuscripts themselves, the majority of which contain a substantial amount of material of ecclesiastical relevance, while three of them show *Sdair Fortibrais* next to the Irish translation of *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*⁹⁹.

⁹²cd.W.Stokes, *Revue Celtique* 19, 1899, pp.14-57, 118-67, 252-91, 364-93.

⁹³See Chapter 4, Section 1.

⁹⁴D.Hyde, *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*, Irish Texts Society vol.19, London, 1917, pp.xi-xiii.

⁹⁵The extracts in Chapter 4 will demonstrate this.

⁹⁶See Appendix 1 below for the complete list. There are two lists of these manuscripts, which list only 6 and 7 manuscripts. R.Flower, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum* vol.2, London, 1926, p.527 omits T.C.D. MS.H.2.17 and King's InnMS.No.10. De Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.172-3 omits R.I.A. 24 P 25, 'Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne'.

⁹⁷Flower, *op.cit.*, p.527.

⁹⁸Listed and discussed by L.J.Emanuel, *The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle: Its Influence and Literary Significance, with Special Reference to Medieval French Literature*, Ann Arbor, 1978, pp.22-52.

⁹⁹B.L. Egerton 1781; T.C.D. MS.H.2.12.; King's InnMS.No.10.

If it is accepted that the popularity of *Sdair Fortibrais* was based on interest in the history of the Relics coupled perhaps with curiosity about the 'crusades' of Charlemagne against the Saracens, it should nevertheless be asked, as before, whether the text could have borne a contemporary political significance.

If the translation was made around 1400, *Sdair Fortibrais* could have been read as an allegory in which the English conquests and settlements in Ireland paralleled the incursions of the Saracens into Europe. At first sight, this interpretation may seem too generalistic. However, Barbour's use of the Fierabras story shows that it was possible for the English to be equated with the Saracens, at approximately the same time.

Tension between Gaelic and Anglo-Irish nations became acute in the later fourteenth century. The English Crown viewed the Gaels as enemies, and consistently distinguished them from the Anglo-Irish¹⁰⁰. Given that Barbour had compared the Fierabras story with a single political event, the campaign of Edward II against Scotland, it may be asked whether *Sdair Fortibrais* could have been similarly deployed in the context of one particular English campaign or set of campaigns in Ireland. The most promising example would be the Irish campaigns of Richard II in the last years of the fourteenth century. These aimed to subjugate the Gaelic chieftains, notably the O'Neills of Ulster, whose power over the Gaelic population had been developing strongly during the early stages of the Gaelic revival¹⁰¹. It would have been easy in a general way to compare the Gaelic Irish to the French, and the English with the Saracens.

More specifically,^{one} of the most notable realisations of this tension of nationality occurred during the Great Schism of 1378-1409. Some of the Gaelic bishops, chiefly

¹⁰⁰ Simms in R.F.Foster (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.86-8. The Statutes of Kilkenny in 1366 are the clearest example of this attempted segregation.

¹⁰¹ *id.*, pp.88-92.

in Connaught, did not recognise the overlordship of the English king, and made so bold as to support the claims of the Avignon pope. For a time, indeed, Avignon supplied Gaels to various sees, while Rome supplied Anglo-Irishmen¹⁰². A text such as *Sdair Fortibrais*, with its pro-French bias, could be taken to contain support for the Avignon cause, as was suggested above for the *Roman de Fierabras*. However, this is still conjectural.

In Northern Ireland, the resentment between the Gaelic lords and the King of England intensified in the early fifteenth century. Niall O'Donnell united Ulster in a campaign against the landowners who lived in England, and extended the power of Ulster into Leinster and Thomond¹⁰³. *Sdair Fortibrais*, which advocated the unity of a nation in pursuit of a Crown, could have been used as propaganda in that context. The earliest manuscript containing *Sdair Fortibrais*, the Liber Flavus Fergusiorum, was compiled in 1437, two years before the death of O'Donnell¹⁰⁴.

In the South of Ireland, the political situation was different. Here it was the Anglo-Irish magnates who held the power¹⁰⁵. One of the most powerful of the Anglo-Irish magnates was James Butler, the White Earl of Ormond, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. A keen supporter of the Lancastrian Kings of England, he had in 1419 led a band of Irishmen, both Gaelic and Anglo-Irish, to fight with Henry V in France¹⁰⁶. He attempted to gain total control over the Irish parliament, but was thwarted by the opposition of another Lancastrian supporter, John Talbot, the Earl of Shrewsbury¹⁰⁷.

¹⁰² This subject is most fully discussed by A.Gwynn in 'Anglo-Irish Church Life: Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries' in P.J. Corish (ed.), *A History of Irish Catholicism* vol.2:4, Dublin, 1968, pp.51-64.

¹⁰³ Simms in R.F. Foster (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.94.

¹⁰⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ Discussed by A. Cosgrove in A. Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, Oxford, 1987, p.570.

¹⁰⁷ Simms in R.F. Foster (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp.95-6.

An interesting manuscript, MS. Bod. Laud 610, written in 1454 was commissioned by his nephew as a memorial to the White Earl. This manuscript incorporates an earlier manuscript also written for the White Earl that contains much early Irish narrative literature, including *Féilire Oengusso* and *Acallam na Senórach*¹⁰⁸. The commemorative manuscript contains a copy of *Sdair Fortibrais*, which, in view of the White Earl's presence in France, can hardly have been intended to evoke English-Saracen parallels. If there was a political *sous entendu*, it must have been intended as an expression of the importance of unity on the part of the subjects of the 'King of France'. It has already been remarked how John Talbot, the arch-adversary of the White Earl, had included a copy of the *Chanson de Fierabras* in his compilation for Henry VI. Here again, the *Fierabras* story cannot have been read as in any way derogatory to the Plantagenet claim to the throne of France.

There is also a further manuscript, T.C.D. MS. H.2.7., which contains a copy of *Sdair Fortibrais* that may have been in some way connected with the Butlers of Ormond. The scribe of this manuscript was Uilliam Mac an Leagha, whose name appears in other work produced for the Butlers¹⁰⁹. This manuscript also contains the only extant copies of *Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás*, *Gyi de Bharbhuic* and *Bibhus de Hamtum*. As well as having an English hero, the last text refers to the Knights Hospitaller, of which order a half-brother of the White Earl, Thomas Baccach Butler, was a prior in Ireland in the early fifteenth century.¹¹⁰ It is perhaps unsurprising that a copy of *Sdair Fortibrais* was included in this manuscript as an adjunct to these other 'historical romances' which could have provided the heroic and romantic ideals for the Butler Earls of Ormond.

¹⁰⁸ This shows the cultural assimilation that was occurring between the Gaels and the Anglo-Irish in Ireland during the fifteenth century.

¹⁰⁹ F. Henry & G. Marsh-Michieli, 'Manuscripts and Illuminations, 1169-1603' in A. Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, pp.803-4.

¹¹⁰ E. Poppe, 'The Irish Version of *Beves of Hamtoun*' in *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 23, pp.97-8.

During the Wars of the Roses the Earls of Ormond remained loyal to the Lancastrian kings. However, the other Anglo-Irish magnates supported the Yorkist faction¹¹¹. This led, during the reign of Edward IV, to the primacy of the Earls of Kildare in the Irish administration¹¹², who governed as independently as possible of the English king¹¹³. During this period Ireland was relatively stable in the internal political sphere¹¹⁴, which, along with the considerable cultural assimilation that had developed between the two 'nations' during the fifteenth century¹¹⁵, assisted the development of a more unified Irish nation. A reflex of this assimilation can be observed in the library catalogue of the Earl of Kildare, which contains items in Irish, English, French and Latin¹¹⁶. One of the English titles in this catalogue is 'Charlemagne'. As the two dateable Irish manuscripts of the late fifteenth century that contain *Sdair Fortibrais*¹¹⁷ couple it the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* in the manner of Jean Bagnyon and William Caxton, it may well be wondered if the Earl's 'Charlemagne' was a copy^{of} Caxton's *Charles the Great*.

Although it has been concluded that the primary interest of the Fierabras story to the Irish readership must have been the history of the Relics of the Passion, it can also be suggested that it was interpretable towards the end of the fifteenth century as promoting the unity of Ireland, just as the English versions can be seen to suggest the unity of England after the Wars of the Roses. This message could have been worth stressing as an aid to political stability between the Gaelic Irish and Anglo-Irish.

¹¹¹ Simms in R.F.Foster (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.96.

¹¹² *ibid.* Following the execution of the Earl of Desmond in 1468 after the king had attempted to obtain control, the Earls of Kildare were "the only surviving Anglo-Irish magnates of the first rank still eligible for high office".

¹¹³ J.F.Lydon, 'Ireland: After 1155' in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol.6, New York, 1985, p.520. Following the proclamation of the Dublin parliament in 1460 that Ireland was "corporate of itself", leaving only the Crown as a symbolic link between the two kingdoms.

¹¹⁴ Simms in R.F.Foster (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.96.

¹¹⁵ *id.*, p.99-101.

¹¹⁶ *id.*, p.99. Also R.Flower, *The Irish Tradition*, Oxford, 1947, p.120.

¹¹⁷ T.C.D. MS.H.2.12. dated 1475; B.L. MS. Egerton 1781, dated 1484.

It could be suggested that this message might have been understood further as a representation of the unity of Ireland and England as the kingdoms of the English Crown. However, despite their support for the Yorkist faction during the 'contention', relations between the Earls of Kildare and the Yorkist kings were strained: both Edward IV and Richard III tried to replace them to gain more effective royal control over Ireland¹¹⁸. The tension worsened after the accession of Henry Tudor 1485. The Anglo-Irish had Lambert Simnel crowned in Dublin in 1487 as King of England¹¹⁹, in open defiance of the nascent royal house in England.

If this tension between Kildare and King were to be applied to a reading of *Sdair Fortibrais*, the French of the story could be the Irish, and the Saracens could be certain unwanted English overlords of Ireland. Such an interpretation could have been most appropriate after 1485: Henry Tudor could have been perceived as stealing the Crown of England, the Anglo-Irish attempting its 'rescue' through Lambert Simnel. It must be noted here that although there are the two manuscripts containing *Sdair Fortibrais* which are known to have been written in the later fifteenth century, neither is dated to after 1487. This would appear to imply that the text had limited use as a specimen of anti-royal propaganda. It seems that any immediate propaganda objective would have been to expound the concept of a 'united' Irish nation, which was being gradually realised during the era of the Kildare government.

The latest datable manuscript containing *Sdair Fortibrais* is the Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne, completed in 1514 in Tory Island, which lies right on the periphery of Ireland, far from any effective power of the King of England. That the Fierabras story was copied in the farthest reaches of Gaelic Ireland seems to add weight to the idea that the Fierabras story was being used to show how even the peoples of the remotest regions of Ireland formed a important part of the Irish nation, a nation which used the

¹¹⁸ J.F.Lydon in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.520.

¹¹⁹ *ibid.*

France of Charlemagne as a role-model. There is no way in which this copy of the Fierabras story could be seen as overtly pro-Tudor.

Summary

If political readings of these texts are sought, it is somewhat easier to see anti-English motivations behind the original translation into Irish of *Sdair Fortibrais*, anti-Valois reasons for its copying in the mid-fifteenth century and reasons of Irish unity for its copying in the later fifteenth century. However, all these political interpretations continue to be conjectural. There is nothing to prove their existence, and a plurality of interpretations can be fitted around the story. The one constant feature of all the copies of this text is the history of the Relics of the Passion and their deposition in Paris. This, as has been maintained, is the basis of the relative popularity of *Sdair Fortibrais* in Irish.

Résumé

The crucial common feature linking all the derivatives of the *Chanson de Fierabras* is the transfer of the Relics of the Passion from Rome to Paris, and their storage in the Sainte-Chapelle. This literal reading of the story provided a Christian justification for the Fierabras story, enabling it to move away from the chanson de geste form. It was necessary to present the information to post-thirteenth-century audiences in media that were acceptable in synchronic terms, and not just those in vogue in the time of Louis IX.

It is noteworthy that a relevant fourteenth or fifteenth-century political interpretation can be found for each extant version of the Fierabras story. These interpretations revolve around the concept of a 'national' unity, which may be the unity of France, of

England, of Gaelic Ireland or of all Ireland. Also, in insular texts, the concept of retrieving a crown, a temporal parallel to the Crown of Thorns, seems to have a special importance, whether it be England claiming France, or Scotland or Gaelic Ireland seeking to expel England. Charlemagne could be used as a role model for all the interested groups.

As all these political interpretations are conjectural, it is impossible to adjudicate between them in specific instances, at least on internal grounds. Nevertheless, the subject matter of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* contains instructive and interesting points which may bear on these wider questions. The following chapter will consider the principal subjects of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*, and how they were presented in the later medieval Irish tradition.

CHAPTER THREE FRANCE, THE SARACENS AND THE RELICS IN THE WRITINGS OF LATER MEDIEVAL IRELAND

Having shown in the last chapter that it would have been possible for a reader of *Gesta Karoli Magni* or *Sdair Fortibrais* to read a contemporary political meaning into the text, an attempt must now be made to establish more directly how the Fierabras story would have appeared in its later medieval Irish setting, by means of reference to the general body of Hiberno-Latin and Irish literature of the late Middle Ages. How, precisely, did the Fierabras story stand within the Hiberno-Latin and Irish historical and literary traditions of Ireland, and how would its contemporary audiences have interpreted the information presented by texts containing it?

To tackle these questions it is expedient to look more closely at some of the leading themes and subjects that appear in the Fierabras story. A comparison between their treatment in *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* and in other texts and genres should provide insights into the achievement and reception of the Fierabras texts. The Fierabras story contains several suitably distinctive themes and subjects, of which three subjects are especially attractive for current purposes: France and the French, the Saracens (or Jews¹), and the Relics of the Passion. It needs to be asked how Irish writers perceived and presented the French and the Saracens. What factual knowledge was available to them, and how did they pass it on? Were they sympathetic or unsympathetic towards these peoples, and how far did their feelings colour their accounts? By getting an impression of the treatment of these subjects in other texts of the period, a basis for assessing their treatment in the Fierabras story should be established².

¹Noting the confusion between these two groups in *Sdair Fortibrais* - the non-Christians are considered as one large group of pagans consisting of Saracens and Jews. The terms are used indiscriminately - to be discussed later in the chapter.

²The research for this section has required a search through a substantial amount of prose and poetry from Ireland in the later Middle Ages. Most of the relevant sources are listed in the bibliography of P.W.Asplin in A Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* 2, pp.869-82.

Two principal groups of texts will be considered: First, the annals, which show a certain awareness of, and interest in, historical events concerning France, the Saracens and the Relics; and second, the narrative and literary texts, comprising 'Matter' and historical translations, travelogues and bardic poems, whose presentation of the French, the Saracens and the Relics displays certain traits and tendencies, and transmits a certain amount of historical information.

The two groups of texts are treated differently. In the case of the annals, relevant events recorded by the annalists are listed chronologically for each of the subjects. This method, besides showing the range of events recorded over the whole period, reveals which annals were better informed on certain periods. For the narrative texts the information concerning each subject is listed separately for each text. The texts themselves are considered in an order which is partly chronological and partly thematically based. The information thus gathered permits a revealing assessment of the sources and methods of the annalists and *littérateurs*.

It must be remembered that materials written in two different languages are under consideration. Each language would, in principle, have had its own audience. To put it crudely, Latin would have been written by and for the clerics and clerical scholars, and Irish by and for the secular *literati* and patrons of literature. The differences between the two languages are quite obvious in the case of the texts studied, as will become clear. Consequently, Latin and Irish texts are treated separately.

The first task is to summarise the treatment of the three main subjects in the two Irish *Fierabras* texts, as a means to providing a basis for comparison. Note that in the case of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* it is unnecessary to distinguish between the Latin and Irish texts: *Sdair Fortibrais* is such a close translation of *Gesta Karoli Magni* that the portrayal of the subjects under consideration is very similar. Although

there are certain interesting adaptations in *Sdair Fortibrais* which are detailed below, their cumulative effect is nevertheless small. Their presence does not weaken the conclusions reached for both texts which rely upon the general dependency of *Sdair Fortibrais* on *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

***Gesta Karoli Magni*³ and *Sdair Fortibrais*⁴**

France

The image of France in the Fierabras story is of a heroic nation, in the vanguard of Christian Europe against the forces of Islam. This image is maintained throughout *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*. It is the French who strive to retrieve the Relics of the Passion from the Saracens. Indeed, the final comment in *Sdair Fortibrais* describes the story as being about Charlemagne, the Crown of Thorns and the relics of the Saints⁵. The first mention of France tells the reader that the story is set at the time when Charlemagne was King of France⁶. Throughout the text, Charlemagne is described as Emperor, showing the connection between France and the Imperial office. The doctrine that France is the senior kingdom in the areas claiming a Roman inheritance, one of the original motives behind the chansons de geste, is thus preserved in the Irish tradition.

The unity of France under Charlemagne is epitomised by the army mustered to retrieve the Relics. The military commanders are the twelve peers, including the names familiar in other chansons de geste, viz., Roland, Oliver, Ogier and Archbishop Turpin. A number of the peers are associated with a particular region or place in the

³References are taken from the edition of *Gesta Karoli Magni* in Part Two. The references cite the Page numbers of the manuscript, printed at the head of each column in the edition.

⁴ed.W.Stokes in *Revue Celtique* 19, pp.14-57, 118-67, 252-91, 364-93.

⁵id., p.380.

⁶Page 85, column 1, §2; Stokes., *op.cit.*, p.16, §1.

French sphere of influence⁷. Of the major French duchies, two are displayed in a particularly impressive light. First, Normandy is championed by Duke Richard. Richard is displayed as a fount of knowledge by his ability to identify Fortibras⁸, and also as a fearless knight when reaching Charlemagne to obtain French aid for the knights besieged by the pagans⁹. The second duchy is Burgundy, ruled by Duke Guy. It is Guy who has won the heart of a pagan princess by his prowess in battle¹⁰, and it is he who is almost killed in an attempt to gain victuals for the besieged Christians¹¹. These regions are portrayed in an entirely positive fashion, an integral part of the French nation.

A number of other territories are mentioned in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, but with less prominence: these are Genoa¹², Geneva¹³, Ardenne¹⁴, Perigord¹⁵, Anjou¹⁶, Amboise¹⁷, Scotland¹⁸ and, interestingly, England¹⁹, giving the reader a sense of the areas in which Charlemagne had influence²⁰. However, only Genoa is preserved in *Sdair Fortibrais*, and this name is usually in given the corrupt form 'Egne'²¹. Perhaps the translator felt the geographical details of the French sphere of influence less

⁷Page 85, column 1, §3; Stokes, *op.cit.*, pp.16-8, §3.

⁸Page 85, column 2, §8; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.20, §8.

⁹*id.*, p.258-268, §171-86.

¹⁰Page 98, column 2, §123; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.146-8, §123.

¹¹*id.*, p.158-166, §145-54.

¹²Page 87, column 1, §21.

¹³Page 95, column 2, §100.

¹⁴Page 97, column 2, §116.

¹⁵Page 87, column 2, §30.

¹⁶Page 92, column 1, §70.

¹⁷Page 91, column 2, §68 - name mis-spelt as 'Ambrois'.

¹⁸Page 93, column 2, §84.

¹⁹Page 98, column 2, §122.

²⁰Note: Ireland is not mentioned. The text could be seen to be giving a positive view of the relationship between the Kings of France, England and Scotland.

²¹Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.26, §21; 'Geneva' also occurs, but is corrupted to 'Genes'. 'Geneva' appears to have been read as 'Genova', the Irish form of the name 'Genoa' - p.132, §100.

important: they added to length of the text²², without developing the theme of French unity²³.

There is a consistent emphasis on the importance of St. Denis as the primate religious centre in France. In the first instance, it is related how the story was found at St. Denis²⁴. Charlemagne swears by St. Denis on two occasions when he has been wronged by members of his own army²⁵. The Saracen Admiral is told that he will be crowned at St. Denis following the defeat of Charlemagne²⁶. The Saracen giant suggests that it would have been better for Charlemagne to have stayed in St. Denis than coming to the pagan city²⁷. Finally, St. Denis is revealed as the place where some of the Relics of the Passion were deposited²⁸. Interestingly, the proximity of St. Denis to Paris is mentioned²⁹. There is no doubt that the symbolic importance of St. Denis is being deliberately, and effectively, promoted.

Overall, *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* do not provide the reader with a large amount of specific historical and geographical information about France. The picture they paint, at a more generalised level, is of a united, strong Christian kingdom, with an overlord who was both king and emperor. The French leaders represent the territories, and are for the most part knights of great prowess, who, despite the occasional fracas, strive against the infidel to rescue the Relics of the Passion.

²²As will be seen in Chapter Four, Section One, the translator of *Sdair Fortibrais* tended to omit lists of names, and unnecessary details.

²³The dropping of the name 'England' could be read as having a political motivation. However, an argument for this could only be supported if a number of the other names were present in the Irish text.

²⁴Page 85, column 1, §1; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.16, §1.

²⁵Page 86, column 1, §11; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.22, §11 - following the death threat from Roland: Page 87, column 1, §20; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.26, §20 - following the treachery of Ganelon.

²⁶Page 98, column 1, §117; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.142, §117.

²⁷*id.*, p.274, §197. *Gesta Karoli Magni* has broken off by this point.

²⁸*id.*, p.378, §256.

²⁹*id.*, p.380, §257.

Saracens (and Jews)

The Saracens are the opponents of the Christian French. In *Gesta Karoli Magni* they are always described as 'Saracens' or 'Pagans'. However, in *Sdair Fortibrais*, the translator also uses the term 'Iubhal' (Jew) to describe this group. In addition, the Latin 'Sarracenus' of *Gesta Karoli Magni* loses its initial 'S-' and becomes 'Eiristin' or 'Eiristineach' in *Sdair Fortibrais*.

Although they appear to be quite significant differences, these complications are explicable. In *Gesta Karoli Magni* the Jews are the people from whom the Relics of the Passion were taken by Helena prior to their transmission to Rome and other religious sites³⁰. The Irish translation seems to be suggesting that after Helena had taken the Relics from the Jews, the Jews came to get them back again³¹. Was he confused, or could he have thought that the element of revenge made for a better story? At all events, the reader of *Sdair Fortibrais* finds the French facing an army who are sometimes called Saracens, and sometimes Jews³².

The dropping of the initial 'S-' may be a matter of the instability of unfamiliar names, compounded in this case by the possibility of aural reinterpretation of 'tS-' as 't-' in the case of radical 't-' with the masculine definite article 'an t-'. Consequently, 'an tSeiristin', which would phonetically be the same as 'an t-Eiristin'³³.

At the end of the day, it may be that distinction between 'Saracens' and 'Jews' meant less to the Irish translator and scribes than appears at first sight. This could suggest that the Saracens as a group meant little to them, or that they did not expect them to

³⁰Page 85, column 1, §1.

³¹Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.16, §1.

³²A further possibility could be that the term 'Iubhal' is a corruption of 'Íbal' or 'Ídal' meaning 'heathen'. However, there is no further textual evidence for this.

³³Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.28, §24. Note also that Irish '(e)iris' means 'faith'. Conjecturally, 'Eiristin' could conceivably have been taken as referring to the 'infidel' nature of the Saracens.

mean much to the readers of *Sdair Fortibrais*. On the other hand, one feature preserved in *Sdair Fortibrais* shows that the Irish translator was not wholly unconcerned with historical realities: he reiterates that the Saracens are followers of Islam, by making them refer regularly to Mohammed as the supreme god³⁴.

These texts call the leader of the Saracens 'the Admiral' (Latin 'Admirandus')³⁵. It is he who leads the Saracens army to destroy Rome and to carry off the Relics³⁶, and it is his execution which marks the final defeat of Saracen power in this particular story³⁷. The names of the lands which he personally rules are not related, but he is portrayed as a person of weak character³⁸, who is prepared to use the services of a criminal to achieve his goal³⁹.

Fortibras, the son of the Admiral, is given a much more impressive profile. He is King of Alexandria, and five other kings are subject to him⁴⁰. His realms also extend to Jerusalem⁴¹, which he enslaved. Thus he is the ruler of a Middle-Eastern empire based in Egypt. He is described as showing magnificent prowess in battle⁴². He is also gracious in defeat, and acknowledges the superiority of the Christian faith⁴³. The opposite of his father in character, it is not surprising that he converts to Christianity⁴⁴ whereas the Admiral stubbornly refuses⁴⁵.

³⁴Page 88, column 2, §41; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.36, §41 - first reference.

³⁵Note: in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, he is at times given the name 'Balan' as in the chanson de geste. This name only appears once in *Sdair Fortibrais*, where it is not clear to whom the text is referring. Even the editor is mistaken. (Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.122, §86 - 'Balan' is identified with 'Brutamint' the gaoler.)

³⁶Page 85, column 1, §2; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.16, §2.

³⁷*id.*, p.374, §243.

³⁸Page 93, column 1, §82; Page 98, column 1, §118; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.120, §82; *id.*, p.144, §118. On both occasions the Admiral is persuaded not to execute the Christians in case his food is ruined!

³⁹Page 99, column 2, §135; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.152, §135. The robber Malpin is shown to be a tool of the Admiral.

⁴⁰Page 87, column 1, §24; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.28, §24.

⁴¹Described as 'Cathair Elena' in *Sdair Fortibrais*.

⁴²Page 85, column 2, §8; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.20, §8.

⁴³Page 91, column 1, §63; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.48, §63.

⁴⁴Page 92, column 2, §74; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.54, §74.

⁴⁵*id.*, p.370, §239.

Further information concerning the lands of the Saracens is not common in the texts. It is stated that after the destruction of Rome, the Saracens retire to the city of Egrimor⁴⁶. Although this city is described as being beautiful and busy, and there is the additional snippet of information that it is only accessible by means of the magnificent bridge of Mantrible⁴⁷, it is not specifically located in Spain as it is in the *Chanson de Fierabras*. The Spanish connection is also lost when one Saracen noble is said to be King of 'Cornubia' in both these texts⁴⁸. It is not until much later in the story that the King of Spain is mentioned as an ally of the pagans⁴⁹, suggesting the Islamic influence in the West. The final paragraph also relates how the pagans then destroyed Spain⁵⁰, the history of which is related in *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*. Whatever the reason for it, there is a notable lack of interest in the geographical associations of the Saracens.

One feature that is preserved in the Irish tradition is the names of the Saracen gods. As well as Mohammed, the images of Margoth, Ternegant/Tregont, Iuipin and Apollo are all found, and destroyed, in the Saracen 'church'⁵¹. Later on, Ternegant is described as the god who will avenge the adultery of a Saracen with a Christian⁵². These idols end up ignominiously being used as missiles against the pagans, showing their impotence as gods. Beyond these snippets of information about geography and religion, there is little information in the texts which would enable the reader to build up a larger picture of the Saracens⁵³.

⁴⁶Page 85, column 1, §2; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.16, §2.

⁴⁷Page 96, column 2- Page 97, column 1, §109-13; Stokes, *op.cit.*, pp.136-40, §109-13. See also description of the beautiful room of Floripes, Page 94, column 2, §92; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.126, §92.

⁴⁸Page 91, column 2, §67; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.50, §67 - the *Chanson de Fierabras* has Coimbra as his power-base.

⁴⁹*id.*, p.370, §237.

⁵⁰*id.*, p.380, §258.

⁵¹Page 100, column 2, §140 (Note, the Saracen church is called a synagogue in *Gesta Karoli Magni*); Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.156, §140.

⁵²*id.*, p.284, §115.

⁵³*id.*, p.254, §162-4. One further point of interest is the reference to camels as forming part of the Saracen livestock.

Relics of the Passion

The Relics of the Passion are mentioned quite frequently in the texts. *Gesta Karoli Magni* describes Helena's removal of the True Cross, the Crown of Thorns and other Relics. They were then dispatched to different destinations, the Crown of Thorns and the Nails going to Rome⁵⁴. *Sdair Fortibrais* is less detailed, but states that the True Cross was removed from Jerusalem, and that the Crown of Thorns and the Nails were in Rome⁵⁵. However, both texts make it clear that the Saracens under the Admiral and Fortibras destroyed Rome and took the Crown of Thorns and other relics to Egrimor⁵⁶.

Capturing the Relics is one of Fortibras's boasts before his defeat, along with the extent of his realms and his enslavement of Jerusalem⁵⁷. He also reveals that he carries with him another Relic, the flasks containing the balsam rubbed onto Christ in the Sepulchre⁵⁸. These flasks are thrown irretrievably into a lake by Oliver⁵⁹.

In Egrimor, the Relics are kept safely. When the French knights are besieged by the pagans, Floripes lays the Relics on a cloth of gold for the knights to worship⁶⁰. After the defeat of the Saracens, Floripes brings out the golden, bejewelled casket in which the Crown of Thorns and the Relics have been kept⁶¹. The authenticity of the Relics is demonstrated by a marvellous smoke and odour⁶². These episodes are designed to emphasise the pricelessness of the Relics of the Passion, and to stress how important it was that they should be in Christian hands.

⁵⁴Page 85, column 1, §1.

⁵⁵Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.16, §1.

⁵⁶Page 85, column 1, §2; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.16, §2.

⁵⁷Page 87, column 1, §24; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.28, §24.

⁵⁸Page 88, column 1, §35; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.32, §35.

⁵⁹Page 89, column 2, §49; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.40, §49.

⁶⁰Page 98, column 1, §124; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.148, §124.

⁶¹*id.*, p.376, §248. Like the shrine in the Sainte-Chapelle.

⁶²*id.*, p.376, §251.

Once Charlemagne recovers the Relics, they do not take them to Rome, but to Paris, where the Crown of Thorns and a Nail were given to St. Denis⁶³. Charlemagne's having a church built in honour of the Relics⁶⁴ is very reminiscent of the building of the Sainte-Chapelle. One of the purposes of these texts was to tell how the Relics of the Passion came to be in Paris. Having been rescued from the Saracens with the greatest of difficulty, it might have seemed foolhardy to return them to Rome after the destruction of that city by the Saracens. Since Charlemagne was King of France as well as Emperor of Rome, it is suggested that a French city would be the obvious place to preserve the Relics of the Passion.

Summary

Gesta Karoli Magni and *Sdair Fortibrais* provide their readership with a limited amount of information concerning France, the Saracens and the Relics of the Passion. This information revolves around certain key matters: Charlemagne as king and emperor, uniting the peers of France, of which Normandy and Burgundy are particularly mentioned; the followers of Mohammed being led by the Admiral and his son, the King of Alexandria and lord of Jerusalem; and the theft of the Relics of the Passion from Rome and their subsequent deposit in Paris.

Although the history of the Relics is prominent, the themes of unity among the Christians and the consequent defeat of the infidels are equally important. That is why political interpretations are possible for these texts. This is particularly true of *Sdair Fortibrais*, where the portrayal of the enemy not as Saracens but as an undifferentiated group of non-Christian opponents could have made the text more easily applicable to a current political event. It is on this basis it can be considered how these subjects appear in other classes of Hiberno-Latin and Irish texts.

⁶³id., p.378, §256.

⁶⁴id., p.380, §257.

Hiberno-Latin Annals

A number of sets of annals were compiled in, and have their main focus in, the later middle ages. Collectively, these annals contain a reasonable number of entries concerning the French, and rather fewer references to the Saracens. These annals, which were for the most part compiled in the areas most loyal to the King of England, notably Dublin and Kilkenny, served as the official histories and records of the monasteries in which they were written. Their compilers included certain foreign events of major importance, alongside more local items. The annals considered here are, in order of citation:

*Annals of Christ Church (AXt)*⁶⁵

These short annals run from the birth of Christ to 1168, and are preserved in the Black Book of Christ Church, which was written in an early fourteenth-century hand for Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin. These annals were used as source material for a number of later sets of annals⁶⁶.

*Annals of the Blessed Virgin Mary Monastery (BVM)*⁶⁷

Preserved in T.C.D. MS. E.3.11 of the late fifteenth century, the annals of this Cistercian monastery in Dublin run from the birth of Christ to 1427. Due to lacunae, only the late eleventh and twelfth centuries are covered in depth. The entries draw on Annals of Christ Church for early events.

⁶⁵ed.A.Gwynn in *Analecta Hibernica* 16, 1946, pp.313-37. The earlier events concerning the French in this chronicle are also included as three out of five entries refer specifically to Charlemagne.

⁶⁶id., p.329. A reconstruction of the annals after 1228 is attempted using other derivative annals.

⁶⁷ed.J.T.Gilbert in *Chartularies of St. Mary's Abbey* 2, London, 1884, pp.241-86.

*Kilkenny Chronicle (KC)*⁶⁸

Preserved in Cotton Ms. Vespasian B. XI., a fragment of the early fourteenth century, these annals from Kilkenny run from 202 up to 1332 concentrating on the period from the late twelfth century. The entries for the early fourteenth century are considerably fuller than the earlier entries, and are similar to the entries in the Annals of John Clyn.

*Annals in MS. Laud 526 (526)*⁶⁹

Preserved in T.C.D. MS. E.4.6 and Bod. MS. Laud 526 of the mid-fifteenth century, these annals run from 1162 to 1370, concentrating on the last years of the thirteenth century and the early fourteenth century. They are attributed to one Pembridge, who appears to have been active in Dublin during this period.

*Annals of Stephen Dexter (SD)*⁷⁰

Preserved in T.C.D. MS. C.5.8 of the fifteenth century, these annals were compiled by the Anglo-Irish Franciscan Stephen Dexter (†1274). Material has been taken from the Annals of Christ Church for early events. However, the annals concentrate on the period from mid-thirteenth century up to 1274.

*Annals of John Clyn (JC)*⁷¹

Preserved only in seventeenth-century copies (T.C.D. MS. E.3.20, Bodleian Rawl. B.496, B.L. Add. MS. 4789), these annals were compiled by the Anglo-Irish

⁶⁸ed.R.Flower, *Analecta Hibernica* 2, 1931, pp.330-340.

⁶⁹ed.J.T.Gilbert, *op.cit.*, pp.303-98.

⁷⁰ed.A.Smith, Dublin 1842.

⁷¹ed.R.Butler, Irish Archaeological Society, Dublin, 1849.

Franciscan John Clyn of Kilkenny (†1349). Also drawing on Annals of Christ Church for early events, these annals become particularly detailed in early fourteenth century.

*Annals of Jacobus Grace (JG)*⁷²

Preserved in T.C.D. MS. E.3.20 of the sixteenth century, these annals run from 1074 to 1370 (followed by a series of obituaries that continue up to 1515) concentrating heavily on the early fourteenth century, describing the Bruce Invasion in considerable detail. These annals were compiled by Grace at Kilkenny around 1537-1539.

*Annals in Add. MS. 4792 (Add.)*⁷³

Preserved in B.L. Add. MS. 4792 of the early fourteenth century, these fragmentary annals run from 1308 to 1310 and 1316 to 1317.

*Annals of Duisk (AD)*⁷⁴

Preserved in the register of the Cistercian abbey of Duisk, T.C.D. MS. E.3.10, these brief annals run from 1167 to 1533.

Here follows a list of all the references made to France, and ^{the} the Saracens and Relics in all these sets of annals, which are identified in the list by the abbreviations shown after their names above:-

⁷²ed.R.Butler, *Annales Hiberniae*, Irish Archaeological Society, Dublin, 1842.

⁷³ed.J.T.Gilbert, *op.cit.*, pp.293-302.

⁷⁴ed.K.W.Nicholls in *Peritia* 2, 1983, pp.92-102.

France⁷⁵

525	AXt	France converted to Christianity.
779/80	AXt	Charlemagne invades Saxony.
781	AXt	Charlemagne goes to Rome.
800	AXt	Charlemagne created Roman Emperor.
819	AXt	Emperor Louis goes to 'Britannia'.
1066	BVM	Duke of Normandy comes to England.
1087	BVM	Death of King William of England and Normandy.
1108	AXt, KC	Death of King Philip of France.
1109	BVM	Matilda marries Geoffrey of Anjou.
1131	BVM	Council of King of France and Bishops concerning Bernard of Clairvaux.
1154	BVM	Henry, Duke of Normandy and King of England, marries Eleanor, becoming Duke of Aquitaine.
1190	526, KC, SD	Kings Philip and Richard travel to Holy Land.
1199	BVM, 526	King John summoned to France concerning Normandy.
1204	JG	John de Courcy of Ulster set as Champion of the King of England against his French counterpart.
1210	526, JG	Anglo-Irish nobles (de Lacys) flee to France.
1216	KC, SD	King Louis of France travels to England.
1226	KC, SD	Louis IX crowned.
1248	KC, SD	Louis IX travels to Holy Land.
1249	KC, SD	Damietta captured by Louis.
1250	526, KC, SD	Louis IX captured by Saracens.
1270	KC	Louis IX travels to Holy Land.
1270	JC	Death of Louis IX of France.
1285	KC	War between Philip of France and Peter of Aragon.

⁷⁵Note: all the items listed below from the annals are listed next to the year that each edition ascribes to the event.

1291	526	War between France and England.
1293	KC	War between France and England over Gascony.
1294	526	Bordeaux occupied by King of France.
1294	JG	William Vesci flees to France.
1295	526	King of France involved in Anglo-Scots war.
1297/8	526, KC	War between Kings of France and England over Flanders.
1299	526	King of England marries sister of French king.
1302	526	Bordeaux returned to England.
1302	KC	French army goes to Flanders.
1303	526, KC	King of France excommunicated; University of Paris deprivileged.
1306	526	Prince of Wales becomes Duke of Aquitaine.
1307	526	King of England marries Isabella of France.
1313	526	King of England bows to order of King of France.
1316	Add.	Death of Louis X of France.
1326	JC	War between Kings of France and England.
1327	JC	War between Edward II of England and Isabella daughter of the King of France.
1338	JC	War between Kings of France and England.
1346	JC	Edward III invades France.
1347	JC	Maurice, Count of Kildare, forces French cities to submit to King of England.
1377	BVM	Death of Edward, King of England and France.
1423	AD	Henry VI of England proclaimed King of France.

Saracens and Relics

1098	AXt	Jerusalem captured from Saracens.
1167	JG	Almaric, King of Jerusalem, took Babylon.
1186/7	AD, 526, KC, SD	Jerusalem and Holy Cross taken by Saracens and Sultan.

1221	BVM	Damietta and Holy Cross taken from Saracens.
1223	KC, SD	Holy Cross traded from Saracens to Christians.
1250	526	Louis IX captured by Saracens.
1287	526	Saracen King Miramomelius overcome.
1289	526	Tripoli taken by Sultan of Babylon.
1291	526, KC	Acon taken by Sultan Milkadar of Babylon.
1299	526	Sultan of Babylon defeated by Cassanus, King of the Tartars.

Summary

Many events are recorded only in one chronicle, indicating that different annalists had different interests and sources. Moreover, individual chronicles tend to be fuller in their reporting of the period in which they were written, which results in fuller coverage, both in general and in respect of the subjects, of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.

The vast majority of entries concerning France and the French refer to the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, and the annals have less to say about Charlemagne and about Franco-English relations in the eleventh, twelfth and fifteenth centuries. Likewise, the Saracens only figure repeatedly in the thirteenth century, in the form of entries relating to landmarks in the expansion of Saracen power and its final defeat. The scatter of entries on the Saracens in the annals shows that they became less important in post-thirteenth-century Ireland. This helps us to understand how the term 'Saracen' could have been corrupted and confused in *Sdair Fortibrais*, and ties in nicely with the early fourteenth-century date that has been proposed for *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

As regards the content of the annals, the parallel between the days of Charlemagne and Louis IX's struggle for Christianity in the thirteenth century is unmistakable. The Christians in Louis's day needed to win Jerusalem and the True Cross from the Sultan of Babylon, the leading Saracen at that time. As has been remarked already, the parallel may have continued beyond the eclipse of the Saracens by the Tartars. Given that the French were engaged in constant warfare (including the Hundred Years War) with the Kings of England up to the middle of the fifteenth century, the Plantagenet Kings of England can, like Louis IX, be seen as being in the same mould as Charlemagne.

A Hiberno-Latin Travelogue

*Itinerarium Symonis Semeonis*⁷⁶

This text, which is partially preserved in a unique manuscript, is a personal account of the journey made in 1323-4 by the Anglo-Irish Franciscan, Simon Semeonis, from his home in Munster to the Holy Land. On his journey, the pilgrim passed through lands occupied by the French and the Saracens. Although this particular account can hardly have been known to any extent in Ireland⁷⁷, the text represents the observations of one fourteenth-century Irishman on his way to Jerusalem, and is hence worth examining in the context of the present enquiry.

⁷⁶ed.M.Esposito, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* vol.4, Dublin, 1960.

⁷⁷id., p.1. The text is preserved in a manuscript from Norwich, dating from 1335-52; id., p.3, Esposito hypothesises that Simon wrote the *Itinerarium* while passing through Norwich on his way back to Ireland. As there is no further information about the life of Simon, one can only speculate whether he returned to Ireland and, if he did, whether he might have taken a copy of the *Itinerarium*, or at least the information contained within, with him. Whatever the exact history, this text, as the work of an Irishman, is still of the utmost importance when considering how France and the Saracens were perceived as concepts in later medieval Ireland.

France and Relics in France

Simon devotes a number of paragraphs to his journey through France⁷⁸. Before arriving in France, Simon notes the alliance that had existed between King Edward of England and King Louis of France in the war against the Saracens, illustrating this united Christian front against the forces of Islam⁷⁹. (Later in the text, he notes the spot in Egypt where King Louis was taken prisoner by the Saracens⁸⁰.) It is noteworthy that this information is given in a completely matter-of-fact way: there is no anti-English or anti-French sentiment at all.

On reaching France, which he describes as a 'Kingdom of a Peaceful King', his first priority is to reach Paris⁸¹. The journey to Paris takes him through Bologne, to see a famous image of the Virgin, and to Amiens to see the cathedral and the head of John the Baptist. These famous Christian attractions figure prominently in his itinerary, and continue to do so when he reaches the Paris region. Indeed, just before arriving in Paris, Simon visits St. Denis, the burial place of the Kings of France, where the Nail of the Holy Cross, crucial to the *Chanson de Fierabras*, is revered.

In Paris itself⁸², which Simon describes as a great centre of learning (presumably with reference to the University), he notes the Cathedral of Notre Dame and the Palace of the King. However, he devotes most space to describing the Sainte-Chapelle, where he saw the Relics of the Passion, including the Crown of Thorns, a cross made out of wood from the True Cross, two of the Nails and the Lance of Longinus. The beauty of the chapel made a great impression on Simon.

⁷⁸id., pp.28-32, §6-12.

⁷⁹id., p.26, §4.

⁸⁰id., p.68, §41.

⁸¹id., p.28, §6 describes all the places visited between the Channel and Paris.

⁸²id., pp.28-30, §7 concerns all the experiences of Simon in Paris.

The remainder of his journey through France took Simon down the rivers Saône and Rhône and along the Côte d'Azur via the cities of Chalon, Lyon, Vienne, Valence, Avignon, Arles, Marseille and Nice⁸³. The religious significance of each of these towns is noted, in particular Avignon, where he heard Pope John XXII celebrating mass.

In summary, Simon sees France as a major kingdom in the Christian world. It is the resting place of the Relics of the Passion, it has a history of crusading kings, and is the kingdom in which the Pope resides. The attitude of Simon towards France is totally positive.

Saracens and Jews

The majority of the extant part of Simon's narrative is concerned with his experiences in Egypt, and the Saracens who inhabit the country⁸⁴. Within this, he provides a number of descriptions of the Saracens as a people, which reveal a mixture of positive and negative attitudes. The hostility between Christianity and Islam is a fundamental theme of the text.

On arriving in Alexandria, he notes how the city is governed by an Admiral, who receives duty on all goods entering the port and listed by the Saracen harbour officials⁸⁵. The officials collecting the duty abuse and spit on the images of Christ and the Virgin, as a way of demonstrating their hostility towards the Christian religion⁸⁶. The Saracen Admiral is echoed in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, which makes Admiral Balan its senior Saracen character. Alexandria figures too, in the sense that the second most senior Saracen leader, Fierabras, is King of Alexandria. The reports and accounts of

⁸³id., pp.30-32, §8-12.

⁸⁴id., pp.46-100, §24-83.

⁸⁵id., p.46, §24.

⁸⁶id., p.48, §26.

travellers like Simon Semeonis would have ensured that Irish audiences knew such basic facts.

Simon notes that the distinction between the various religious fraternities is very clearly marked in the city. The four principal groups, Saracens, Christians, Greeks and Jews, are distinguished by their dress⁸⁷. The Saracens are presented as the dominant group, who even bolt the others in their houses during prayer time on Fridays⁸⁸. Simon is careful to distinguish between Saracens and Jews, a distinction which has been seen to be lacking in *Sdair Fortibrais*. Also in this section Simon provides a lengthy description of the Muslim practices of the Saracens, noting the form of their dress, and the sheltering of women in Saracen society⁸⁹. A description of the teaching of the Qu'ran explains whence these practices are derived⁹⁰.

Leaving Alexandria, Simon journeys up the Nile to Cairo, the rich capital city of Egypt⁹¹. The supreme ruler of the Saracens is the Sultan, to whom all the Admirals are responsible. The Sultan controls the army, upon which the Saracens rely for their defence⁹². The centralised military organisation of the Saracens which is presented in the chansons de geste is obviously based on historical fact.

In a garden in Cairo are two important natural phenomena. The first is an inexhaustible spring. The second is a vine which emits a precious healing ointment, which is especially efficacious for Christians⁹³. Reflections of both these items can be found in the *Chanson de Fierabras*, and subsequently in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The spring is reminiscent of the girdle of Floripes which satisfied continually the hunger

⁸⁷id., p.58, §35. The term 'Christian' refers to the Catholics, whereas 'Greek' is used for members of the Orthodox church.

⁸⁸id., p.50, §28.

⁸⁹id., pp.58-60, §35-6.

⁹⁰id., p.52, §30.

⁹¹id., pp.66-72, §39-47.

⁹²id., p.72, §47.

⁹³id., pp.80-2, §57-8.

of the Christian knights. More strikingly, the healing vine appears to be reflected in two places: first, in the holy balsam which Fierabras offers to Oliver prior to their battle; and second, in the healing fruit which Floripes picks from her garden.

Near Cairo is the town of Babylon, in which is located a church where the Virgin spoke to Christians suffering Saracen persecution⁹⁴. In addition to its testimony to the hostility between Christians and Saracens, this episode suggests an explanation as to why the leader of the Saracens is referred to as the 'Sowdon of Babilon' in the English romance of that name.

Throughout his stay in Egypt, Simon notes the well-developed Saracen infrastructure. He reveals that the land is very fertile and provides a considerable range of produce⁹⁵. He remarks on the great wealth and advantages of Egypt as a country, in particular with the riches of Alexandria⁹⁶ and Cairo⁹⁷. However, he also notes that both cities, despite their outwardly glorious appearance, contain scenes of poverty and squalor as well. In addition, he cannot resist deriding the Saracens for certain customs, for example their unpleasant personal habits⁹⁸, and their habit of riding horses side-saddle 'even though they are good archers'⁹⁹. An underlying vein of disdain is always present.

The last references to the Saracens in the *Itinerarium* relate to Simon's journey to, and arrival in, Jerusalem. Simon is particularly impressed by the camel service provided by the Saracens to take Christians to Jerusalem and Muslims to Mecca¹⁰⁰. However, he notes that this journey is not always predictable as it passes through the land of the

⁹⁴id., p.88, §67.

⁹⁵id., p.70, §43.

⁹⁶id., p.56, §33, p.62, §37. Noted is the importance of silk, linen and cotton production.

⁹⁷id., p.74-6, §48-50. Cairo makes much use of Saracen style decoration, including Damascus glass, spices, flowers and fruit.

⁹⁸id., p.102, §85.

⁹⁹id., p.78, §53.

¹⁰⁰id., p.98, §81.

Bedouins, who are distinguished from the Saracens as a group¹⁰¹. When he reaches Jerusalem he emphasises that the city is under Saracen domination¹⁰². It would have been difficult for him to contemplate the Holy City without thinking of the struggles of the Christian crusaders.

When describing other groups of people that he has encountered on his journey, Simon has a particularly negative attitude towards the Jews. Although they inhabit wealthy cities such as Alexandria¹⁰³, Simon always describes them as 'Judei perfidi'¹⁰⁴. He also notes that Mohammed has referred to the Jews as the 'Murderers of the Prophets' in the Qu'ran¹⁰⁵, and that the Saracens call the Jews 'lihud', that is 'dogs'¹⁰⁶.

Relics and Jerusalem

After arriving in Jerusalem, Simon visits a subterranean church which leads to the place where Helena discovered the wood of the True Cross¹⁰⁷. Helena's discovery of the Cross would have been known to Simon beforehand through the account of *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*. He would also have found a representative of the story preserved in a window in the Sainte-Chapelle, when he went to see the Crown of Thorns and the other Relics of the Passion¹⁰⁸. As has been seen, *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* formed the preface to all the extant copies of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*.

¹⁰¹ id., pp. 100-2, §84.

¹⁰² id., p. 106, §93.

¹⁰³ id., p. 58, §34.

¹⁰⁴ id., p. 38, §17.

¹⁰⁵ id., p. 52, §29.

¹⁰⁶ id., p. 54, §31.

¹⁰⁷ id., p. 108, §96.

¹⁰⁸ id., p. 31, §7.

Summary

Simon seeks to provide as much information as possible about the Saracens and the Holy Land, subjects which would have been unfamiliar to most Irishmen. Simon also passes to the reader information about the principal sites of Christendom that lie on the journey from Ireland to Egypt. Certain parallels between the *Itinerarium* and the Fierabras texts from Ireland are interesting: most notably, their common awareness of the story of Helena's discovery of the True Cross as found in *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, and their demonstration that the Relics of the Passion had come to be in preserved in Paris. As mentioned earlier, these similarities may suggest that *Gesta Karoli Magni* was written at a similar date to the *Itinerarium*.

Irish Annals

Unlike the Hiberno-Latin annals, the principal Irish annals come for the most part from the Upper Shannon region, that is East Connaught and South Ulster, this being the area which best preserved the literary culture of Gaelic Ireland in the later Middle Ages¹⁰⁹. The annals show the respect that was given to Irish, when the annals of the Anglo-Irish East were being written in Latin. The following sets of annals are used in this survey¹¹⁰:

¹⁰⁹ Considering the relatively large number of manuscripts that can be localised to this region from 1350-1500.

¹¹⁰ Note: this survey does not include the *Annals of the Four Masters* which fall outside the scope of the present enquiry.

*Annals of Ulster (AU)*¹¹¹

This complete chronicle runs from the arrival of Christianity in Ireland to the mid-sixteenth century, especially detailed in the later centuries. The Irish text is preserved in two manuscripts of fifteenth and sixteenth-century date, T.C.D. MS. H.1.18 and Rawl. B.489. There are seventeenth-century copies in Irish, English and Latin.

*Annals of Inisfallen (AI)*¹¹²

The only chronicle listed here from Munster, the text runs from Abraham down to 1320 and some later additions, and becomes more detailed after the middle of the eleventh century. These annals are preserved in MS. Rawlinson B.503.

*Annals of Clonmacnoise (ACI)*¹¹³

These annals run from the Creation down to 1408, with the emphasis on the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Preserved only in a seventeenth-century English translation by Conell Mageoghagan, the final date indicates their reliance on a late medieval source text.

*Annals of Loch Cé (ALC)*¹¹⁴

The principal annals of the monastery of Loch Cé run from 1014 to 1590, the later centuries being covered in detail. They are preserved in the sixteenth-century T.C.D. MS. H.1.19.

¹¹¹ ed. W.M. Hennessy, Dublin, 1887, for H.M.S.O.

¹¹² ed. S. Mac Airt, Dublin, 1951.

¹¹³ ed. Rev. D. Murphy S.J., Dublin, 1896.

¹¹⁴ ed. W.M. Hennessy, London, 1871.

*Annals of Connaught (AC)*¹¹⁵

Another detailed set of annals running from 1224 to 1544, they cover much of the same ground as the Annals of Loch Cé. They are preserved in the early sixteenth-century R.I.A. MS. Stowe C.III.1.

*Annals of Boyle (AB)*¹¹⁶

These annals are the earliest chronicle from Loch Cé, running up to the thirteenth century. They are preserved in B.L. Cotton MS. Titus A.xxv.

The information taken from the Irish annals is presented here in the same manner as was used previously for the Hiberno-Latin annals:-

France

810/2	ACI, AU	Death of Emperor Charles, King of Franks and Emperor of Rome.
837	ACI	Death of King and Emperor Louis the Pious.
1027	ACI	Death of King Richard of France.
1135	ACI	Death of Henry, King of France and Saxony.
1167	ACI	Henry II went to Ireland instead of France.
1215-7	ACI, AI, ALC	Death/Deposition of King John of England; Son of King of France is the new English King.
1227	AC, ALC	Death of Louis VIII of France.
1243	AC, ALC, AU	King of England requests help of Anglo-Irish in campaign against King of France.
1248	AC, ALC	King of France travels to defend Jerusalem.

¹¹⁵ed.A.M.Freeman, Dublin, 1944.
¹¹⁶ed.A.M.Freeman in *Revue Celtique* 41-4, 1924-7.

1254	AC, ALC	Three year peace between King of France and Saracens in Jerusalem.
1263	AI	War between England and France; Prince Edward taken prisoner.
1270	ACI, AI, ALC	Death of Louis IX of France.
1295	AI, AC, ALC, AU	War between England and France over Gascony.
1296	AI	Death of brother of Edward I in Gascony.
1297	AI, AC, AU	Fruitless campaigns by Edward I in France.
1311	AI	15 th General Council in France (Vienne).
1313	ACI, AC, ALC, AU	Death of Philip IV of France.
1316	AI	Death of Louis, son of Philip IV of France.
1326	AC, ALC, AU	War between Kings of France and England.
1326	ACI	Death of French King.
1327	ACI, AU	War between Edward II of England and Isabella daughter of the King of France.
1338	ACI, AC, ALC	War between Kings of France and England.
1355	ACI, AC, ALC	King of France taken by King of England.
1418	AC	France devastated by King of England.
1419	AC, ALC, AU	Earl of Ormond, along with Gaelic and Anglo-Irish nobles, helps King of England in France.
1422	AC	King of England poisoned in France.
1425	AU	Mortimer becomes guardian of England, Anglo-Irish and most of France.
1522	AC, AU.	France and Scotland are victorious over other Western European nations.

Saracens

1186	AB	Jerusalem and Holy Cross captured by Saracens.
1254	AC, ALC	Three year peace between King of France and Saracens in Jerusalem.
1268	AC, ALC	'Emperor' Charles killed by Saracens.

1299	ACI, AC, ALC, AU	Sultan of Babylon and Saracens defeated by King of Tartary and Armenia.
------	---------------------	---

Relics

1492	AC, ALC, AU	Nameplate of Holy Cross found in Rome, buried by Helena. Also spearhead of Longinus.
------	-------------	--

Summary

To a greater extent than occurs in the Hiberno-Latin annals, the events of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are recorded in more than one of the Irish chronicles originating in the monasteries of the Upper Shannon region. These common entries show that the annalists were not operating independently. Somehow, information was being passed from one annalist to another, allowing a number of annals to share the same basic material.

As with the Hiberno-Latin annals, the majority of entries concerning France are located in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, and there is considerably less information on the eleventh and twelfth centuries. There is, however, a somewhat greater number of entries for the early fifteenth century, presumably related to the increased quantity of writing in vernacular Irish that is extant from the post-Black Death period. On the other hand, as with the Hiberno-Latin annals, references to the Saracens date from the thirteenth century, ending with the Saracen defeat by the Tartars.

Overall, the Saracens are mentioned on considerably fewer occasions than in the Hiberno-Latin annals. They are known only as the conquerors of Jerusalem, who fought the French, and were defeated by the Tartars. The Irish annals stress the conflicts between England and France throughout the period. They never refer to the

King of England as the King of France, though Mortimer is described in the Annals of Ulster as the guardian of the Anglo-Irish, England and France. This failure to recognise the French claim of the King of England could be taken to imply a sympathy for France: but there is not a lot of evidence for such a bias in the material as a whole.

Two Irish Translations involving Charlemagne

*Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*¹¹⁷

The other major representation of the 'Matter of France' is the Irish translation of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, entitled *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*. As noted previously, the translation is considered to have been made at approximately the same time as *Sdair Fortibrais*, around the year 1400¹¹⁸.

Given the popularity of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* throughout Europe¹¹⁹, it is not surprising that a translation into Irish was made. Like *Sdair Fortibrais*, it proved a success, and ^{the} text is preserved in seven fifteenth-century manuscripts¹²⁰. The *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* was also read in the original Latin in Ireland, as the copy in manuscript T.C.D. 667 testifies¹²¹. However, as this is the only extant copy of the Latin text in an Irish manuscript, it can be presumed that the story was better known in Ireland through the Irish translation, *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*.

¹¹⁷ed.D.Hyde, Irish Texts' Society vol.19, London, 1917.

¹¹⁸id., p.vi.

¹¹⁹A. de Mandach, *Naissance et Développement de la Chanson de Geste en Europe* vol.1, Geneva, 1961, pp.387-98, lists over 300 manuscripts of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* and its daughter versions. The French daughter versions are discussed by L.J.Emanuel, *The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle: Its Influence and Literary Significance with Special Reference to Medieval French Literature*, Ph.D. 1978, Penn. State University, pub. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor & London, 1980, pp.22-52.

¹²⁰R.Flower, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum* vol.2, London, 1926, p.527.

¹²¹M.L.Colker, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts in T.C.D.* vol.2, Scholar Press, Aldershot, p.1109.

France

Like the *Chanson de Fierabras*, the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* is concerned to represent Charlemagne as the leading ruler of Christian Europe, in the vanguard of the crusading movement to rid the continent of the Saracen menace. In the chronicle, the ultimate prizes for Charlemagne are the liberation of the tomb of St. James, the expulsion of the Saracens, and the reconquest of Spain.

The fact that Charlemagne is King of France and Roman Emperor is less important than in *Sdair Fortibrais*. After Spain, France is where most of the action of the chronicle takes place; Charlemagne functions primarily as the leader of the coalition of territories subservient to him. In the first list provided, he is master of England, France, Germany, Bavaria, Denmark (Scandinavia), Burgundy, Italy and Brittany and a number of other countries not named¹²². This list is meant to represent the nations that had been incorporated into the Western Christendom by the time of Charlemagne himself¹²³. The role of England as a subordinate to Charlemagne's France is interesting: it is a feature that was present in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, but missing from *Sdair Fortibrais*. Here, an Irish translation has preserved the information.

In the same vein, France figures in the perhaps significant list of places travelled by the star which revealed the position of the tomb of St. James¹²⁴. The star passed between Germany and Italy, France and Guyenne, Gascony and Navarre (and Spain) up to Galicia. This list shows awareness of the fact that Aquitaine (Guyenne and Gascony) were not part of France, an interesting insight into Irish perceptions of the political geography of Europe in the later middle ages.

¹²² Hyde, *op.cit.*, p.4, Ch.1. Note: 'Lochlann' is the name used to express 'Denmark'. Of course, around the time of the translation of this text, Scandinavia was united under Danish rule following the Union of Kalmar.

¹²³ The expansion of Carolingian power is discussed by R.McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751-987*, London, 1983, esp. pp.41-76.

¹²⁴ Hyde, *op.cit.*, pp.2-4, Ch.1.

It is made clear that earlier the Kings of France and Emperors of Germany had tried to drive the Saracens from Spain, but only Charlemagne accomplished this feat completely¹²⁵. With a specifically French audience in mind, the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* actually lists the other French kings who had attempted the reconquest of Spain, from Clovis to Charles the Bald¹²⁶. The effect of this passage is to emphasise the influence of France, Spain's nearest neighbour, on Spanish history. This list is preserved in the Irish translation.

After the liberation of Santiago, Charlemagne returns to France and constructs churches in Aachen, Paris and Toulouse¹²⁷. Although Paris is honourably mentioned, it is not given the supreme importance it receives in *Sdair Fortibrais*. Aachen is named as the capital of Charlemagne, while Paris is portrayed as the capital of the future. By this device, the empire of Charlemagne is connected to the contemporary French kingdom, in anticipation of the historical development.

A portion of the conflict between Christian and Saracen is set in Gascony¹²⁸. The Saracen king Agiolandus takes first Agen¹²⁹ and then Saintes,¹³⁰ where he is defeated by the army of Charlemagne. On both occasions Agiolandus escapes, by means of the rivers Garonne and Carenton respectively. It is easy to see a parallel between the Saracen invasion of Gascony in the early eighth century, and the conflicts between England and France over Gascony during the Hundred Years' War. Any Irish readers who knew where Agen and Saintes were located, would have been reminded that this region had long since been a zone of conflict, and not held unchallenged by the King of France.

¹²⁵ id., p.8, Ch.3.

¹²⁶ id., p.10, Ch.3.

¹²⁷ id., p.12, Ch.4.

¹²⁸ id., p.32, Ch.10 for reference to Gascony.

¹²⁹ id., pp.22-4, Ch.6.

¹³⁰ id., pp.24-6, Ch.7.

A more complete list of the Peers of Charlemagne is given in *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*: Turpin, the Archbishop of Rheims; Roland; Milo; Oliver; Arastandus of Brittany; Englerus of Guyenne; Gaferus of Bordeaux; Gandeolus of Frisia; Othgerus of Denmark (Scandinavia) and Constantinus, the Roman Prefect¹³¹. This list clearly shows the impressive extent of the empire of Charlemagne. It also shows the position of France in the centre of Christian Europe, a cultural sphere that stretched from the imperial and papal city in the South to the wildernesses of Scandinavia in the North.

Another list of the allies of Charlemagne is provided when Spain is divided up between its reconquerors: Navarre goes to the Normans; Castille and Galicia to the Franks; Saragossa to the Greeks and Apulians; Aragon to the Picards; Andalusia to the Germans; Portugal to the Danes (Scandinavians) and the Flandrians¹³². This list includes Germany as one of the allies, and adds Apulia and Greece which were falling under Norman and French influence around the time of composition of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* in the twelfth century¹³³.

France also appears in *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* as a place of death and burial. Following the Battle of Ronceval, two graveyards, at Arles and Bordeaux are said to have been consecrated to receive the dead warriors¹³⁴. Roland is buried in Blaye¹³⁵. In Vienne, Turpin has a vision of the death of Charlemagne, and dies there himself¹³⁶. However, the emperor actually dies in Aachen. As remarked already, this text knows nothing of the claim that the centre of Charlemagne's rule was in Paris¹³⁷.

¹³¹ *id.*, pp.28-30, Ch.8.

¹³² *id.*, pp.66-8, Ch.16.

¹³³ Apulia was part of Norman Sicily, subsequently under the control of Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX. French cultural influence was felt in Greece as a result of the crusades.

¹³⁴ Hyde, *op.cit.*, p.100, Ch.19.

¹³⁵ *id.*, p.102, Ch.19.

¹³⁶ *ibid*; also, *id.*, p.110, Ch.19.

¹³⁷ *id.*, p.104, Ch.19.

In summary, France is portrayed as a central part of the Christian empire of Charlemagne, the country from which the conquest of Spain can be launched. The subordinate regions of the Frankish Empire and of Western Christendom are made out to be entirely supportive of Charlemagne, and all act in unison. France itself is portrayed positively; the sole enemies are the Saracens, who are described entirely negatively.

Saracens and Spain

Unlike *Sdair Fortibrais*, the initial S- in the name 'Saracen' is preserved in *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*. This small difference epitomises a greater interest in, and grasp of, historical fact on the part of the translator of this informative text. The chief zone of conflict between Christian and Saracen is Spain. The Saracens are masters of the whole of Spain, and would have remained so if St. James had not ordered Charlemagne in a vision to liberate his tomb in Galicia from the Saracens¹³⁸. Charlemagne's campaign is totally successful: he captures Pamplona and proceeds to subdue the rest of the country, converting Saracens to Christianity¹³⁹.

The power of Islam in Spain is deeply rooted. The Spanish had reverted to Islam after being previously conquered by a Christian ruler¹⁴⁰. The centre of Islamic religion in Spain is Cadiz, where the image of Mohammed is located. As in *Sdair Fortibrais* and the *Itinerarium*, the Muslim gods are portrayed as pathetic idols¹⁴¹.

Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir makes the reader more aware that the Saracens of Spain are part of a wider civilisation. After Charlemagne's initial campaign, King Agiolandus,

¹³⁸ Hyde, *op.cit.*, p.4, Ch.1.

¹³⁹ *id.*, pp.6-10, Ch.2-3.

¹⁴⁰ *id.*, p.8, Ch.3.

¹⁴¹ *id.*, p.10, Ch.4.

who is described as African, comes to Spain¹⁴². He proves a formidable adversary for Charlemagne in Gascony and Spain. His army comprises Saracens along with Moors, Moabites, Negroes, Parthians, Africans and Persians along with the kings of Arabia, Alexandria, Bugia, Aqaba, Barbary and Cordoba¹⁴³. The entire North African and Middle Eastern world is thus seen as coming together under the Saracen banner to meet the forces of Christendom in Spain. The political geography of this account may be compared with that contained in *Sdair Fortibrais* and the *Itinerarium*, in which the Saracen world is likewise portrayed as an empire stretching from Egypt and Alexandria.

It is noteworthy that the giant Ferracutus who fights Roland is sent by one Admirandus, King of Babylon¹⁴⁴. Admirandus, as has been seen, was the title of the father of Fierabras; the name is also reminiscent of the officials of Saracen Egypt known as the 'admirals', as described in the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis. The theme of pagan giant fighting Christian knight, as well as being Biblical, is also found in *Sdair Fortibrais*.

It is the Admiral of Babylon who sends the kings Marsirius and Belagandus to Saragossa in an attempt to rescue Spain for the Saracen world¹⁴⁵. This leads directly to the Battle of Ronceval¹⁴⁶, and although the story is told in a different way in the *Chanson de Roland*¹⁴⁷, the basic elements, such as the treachery of Ganelon, the horn of Roland, and the subsequent deaths of both Ganelon and Roland are all described. The Saracens show unheroic qualities when they conspire with one of the Christians. The latter show heroic virtues, except for that part of the Christian army which sins

¹⁴² *id.*, p.12, Ch.4.

¹⁴³ *id.*, p.22, Ch.6. 'Cordoba' is misspelt as 'Cornubia' in Irish translation.

¹⁴⁴ *id.*, p.48, Ch.15.

¹⁴⁵ *id.*, p.76, Ch.19.

¹⁴⁶ *id.*, pp.76-80, Ch.19.

¹⁴⁷ Discussed by de Mandach, *op.cit.*, pp.149-56.

with the Saracen women, sent to them by Ganelon¹⁴⁸. Their subsequent defeat is retribution for that lapse.

The evil nature of the Saracens is displayed at the battle of Cordoba, when the Saracen warriors all wear devil-shaped masks and carry tabors in an attempt to intimidate¹⁴⁹. The intimidation is effective, and the horses of the Christians flee the battlefield. However, the superficial nature of this disguise is revealed when the horses have their eyes and ears covered.

In *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*, the Saracens serve as the great enemy from whom Spain must be reconquered for Christendom. As in *Sdair Fortibrais*, they are shown to be a group coming from a wide area of Africa and the Middle East, with a power-base in Egypt. The idea of the Saracens as evil beings chimes with *Sdair Fortibrais*, which sent the same message to its Irish readers. By contrast, the armies of France are divinely inspired, and essentially good.

Relics

There are no direct references to the Relics of the Passion in *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*. Comparison may be made, however, with the role of the shrine of St. James at Compostella¹⁵⁰. Just as the *Chanson de Fierabras* can be seen as an advertisement for the Relics of the Passion in the Sainte Chapelle, the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* gives honour to Santiago del Compostella. Thus *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* explains how Compostella came to be one of the three apostolic seats, along with Rome and Ephesus¹⁵¹.

¹⁴⁸ Hyde, *op.cit.*, p.80, Ch.19.

¹⁴⁹ *id.*, p.64, Ch.16.

¹⁵⁰ *id.*, p.4, Ch.1.

¹⁵¹ *id.*, p.70, Ch.17.

Summary

The fifteenth-century readers of *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* gained an impression of Spain as a battleground, in which France led the Christian vanguard against the Saracen occupiers. A wide range of information regarding the areas in which both France and the Saracens had influence is provided; it would not have conflicted with the eye-witness accounts of pilgrims, as represented by the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis. It is hard to see if *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* could have carried any contemporary political nuances, beyond the most general endorsement of the optimistic scenario in which right triumphs over might and oppressors get expelled.

*Sdair na Lumbardach*¹⁵²

Sdair na Lumbardach consists of a translation of an extract from the *Legenda Aurea*¹⁵³. It is found only in the Book of Lismore, compiled in Munster around 1487¹⁵⁴. Its major focus is the history of Italy from the time of the arrival of the Lombards. It deals incidentally with Italian-French relations at the time of Charlemagne, and with Italian contacts with the Saracens. The purpose of the translation would appear to have been historical: to improve the state of knowledge about Western Christendom and, more particularly, the Italian peninsula in later fifteenth-century Ireland.

¹⁵²ed.G.Mac Niocaill in *Studia Hibernica* 1, 1961, pp.89-118.

¹⁵³id., p.89.

¹⁵⁴F.Henry and G.Marsh-Micheli, 'Manuscripts and Illuminations, 1169-1603' in A.Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, Oxford, 1987, p.801. The manuscript was written towards the end of the fifteenth century for a wedding between the Fitzgeralds of Desmond and the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family. See also W.Stokes, *Lives of the Saints from the Book of Lismore*, Oxford, 1890, pp.xxii-xxiii for a list of the contents of the manuscript.

France

The central French figure in *Sdair na Lumbardach* is Charlemagne, son of Pepin¹⁵⁵. It is he who goes to Italy to help the Pope against the Lombard king¹⁵⁶. Following a successful campaign, Charlemagne is able to absorb Italy into his Roman Empire¹⁵⁷. He is crowned Western Roman Emperor by Pope Leo¹⁵⁸, and his two sons, Louis and Pepin rule in Occitania and Italy respectively¹⁵⁹. This arrangement is justified by the claim that the Romans and the French had agreed that the two states should be merged, and their ruler chosen from the French¹⁶⁰. *Sdair na Lumbardach* provided Irish readers with fresh information concerning Charlemagne and France, and with a different perspective from what was already available in *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*.

The portion of *Sdair na Lumbardach* leading up to the time of Charlemagne deals briefly with the relationship between the French, the Lombards and the Papacy in the preceding centuries¹⁶¹. Kings of France mentioned briefly include Pepin and Childeric¹⁶², Clovis¹⁶³ and Rathordus¹⁶⁴, thus giving some further, if scanty, information about the important political characters that preceded Charlemagne. Important ecclesiastics of former centuries are also described: Charlemagne himself is considered alongside the Church Fathers (whose major writings are listed)¹⁶⁵.

¹⁵⁵ Mac Niocaill, *op.cit.* pp.105-9, 1.609-773 - the section concerning Charlemagne.

¹⁵⁶ *id.*, p.105, 1.609-21.

¹⁵⁷ *id.*, p.105, 1.625-32.

¹⁵⁸ *id.*, p.106, 1.661-3. In addition, it is noted that the Eastern Empire has been in the hands of the Greeks since the time of Constantine, son of Helen; *id.*, p.106, 1.663-72.

¹⁵⁹ *id.*, p.105, 1.635-6.

¹⁶⁰ *id.*, p.106, 1.672-6.

¹⁶¹ *id.*, pp.100-105, 1.434-609.

¹⁶² *id.*, p.101, 1.444-5.

¹⁶³ *id.*, p.103, 1.526-34.

¹⁶⁴ *id.*, p.104, 1.566-579

¹⁶⁵ *id.*, pp.107-8, 1.692-739

Charlemagne's close interest in the Church is witnessed by his relationship with two ecclesiastics: the historical Alcuin¹⁶⁶, and the literary hero Turpin¹⁶⁷.

Following the death of Charlemagne, his son Louis became emperor, and he in turn was succeeded as emperor by his son Lothair¹⁶⁸, although the empire was divided into three realms, one for each of Louis's sons: Charles was given France, Louis Germany, and Lothair kept Italy and Lorraine¹⁶⁹. As a result of this settlement France began to go its own way again, no longer really a part of the Roman Empire. The imperial title passed eventually to Otto¹⁷⁰, whose origins are unclear; during the Ottonian period the interest of *Sdair na Lumbardach* in France is lost¹⁷¹.

Saracens

The initial S- of 'Saracen' is preserved, as perhaps would be expected in more historical milieux. A section on the rise of the Saracens, forming a digression from the main text, places the history of the Lombards in relation to this major event of Mediterranean history¹⁷². The Saracens began to play a major role when the doctrine of Mohammed began to gain ground. Although Mohammed was a false prophet¹⁷³, his followers quickly established themselves around Alexandria¹⁷⁴, which they took over from the longer established Christians and Jews¹⁷⁵. This new faith spread over the Middle East, encompassing Arabia, Antioch and Jerusalem¹⁷⁶, and the writings and preaching of Mohammed were powerfully instrumental in the process.

¹⁶⁶id., p.106, l.681.

¹⁶⁷id., p.108, l.753.

¹⁶⁸id., p.109, l.801-6. Lothair's accession was not supported by his two brothers, Charles and Louis.

¹⁶⁹id., p.109, l.806-10.

¹⁷⁰id., p.111, l.889-90.

¹⁷¹id., p.113-5, l.955-1049. One further emperor, Conrad, is described as being a noble of France. However, the text does not say anything about France or the French themselves.

¹⁷²id., p.95-100, l.212-434 - the section on Mohammed and the Saracens.

¹⁷³id., p.95, l.213 - 'fáidh fallsa'.

¹⁷⁴id., p.95, l.230.

¹⁷⁵id., p.96, l.237-8. Note the clear distinction between Saracen and Jew.

¹⁷⁶id., p.97, l.282-312.

Mohammed's claim that the Angel Gabriel spoke to him is invoked to explain how he made himself leader of the Saracens¹⁷⁷.

The remainder of the section deals with Islamic custom, noting especially how the burial place of Mohammed, which is as revered by the Saracens as is the Holy Sepulchre by the Christians, was also the resting place of Adam, Abraham and Ishmael¹⁷⁸. However the bulk of the section deals with Islamic marriage customs, as having been ordained by Mohammed¹⁷⁹. The above information differs from, but complements, what is given in the *Itinerarium*. Nevertheless, the concept of a Saracen powerbase in Alexandria would have been one familiar to the readers of the 'Matter of France' translations.

Summary

Although *Sdair na Lumbardach* would have had only a limited readership towards the end of the fifteenth century, it increased the corpus of factual knowledge about the history of Charlemagne in Europe, and about the origin of Islam in the Saracen countries. The information complements what is contained in *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*, and is consistent with them; it appears, for instance, that an Irish reader interested in the Saracens could have gleaned a reasonable amount of coherent and consistent information about them from a variety of sources.

¹⁷⁷ id., pp. 97-8, l. 313-27.

¹⁷⁸ id., p. 98, l. 345-54.

¹⁷⁹ id., pp. 98-9, l. 355 ff.

The Irish 'Matter of Britain' Translations

Gyi o Bharbhuic and *Bibhus o Hamtuin*¹⁸⁰

These 'Matter of Britain' romances were translated from an English source some time in the mid-fifteenth century¹⁸¹. Preserved together in a single manuscript¹⁸², they presumably would not have reached a large audience. However, they contain a number of references to France and the Saracens.

France

In *Gyi o Bharbhuic* France is merely a land through which the English knight Guy travels on his way to Lombardy. An interesting distinction is made between France and what could be termed the duchies of Normandy, Brittany and Burgundy. The first place that Guy lands on leaving England is Normandy¹⁸³, where his arms are given to him, together with an explanation of the nature of his quest. Here, the promotion of these French regions to the status of independent principalities helps to give distance to the world that Guy is entering at the start of his adventure.

On leaving Normandy Guy passes through France, which is cursorily described as 'broad and fair'¹⁸⁴, on his way to Lombardy. He passes thence into Brittany, where he refuses the offer of marriage to the daughter of the earl after gaining victory in a tournament¹⁸⁵. He then revisits Normandy, where a further offer of marriage, this

¹⁸⁰ ed.F.N.Robinson in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 6, 1908, pp.9-180 & 273-338.

¹⁸¹ id., p.9-19

¹⁸² T.C.D. MS.H.2.7, scribe Uilliam Mac an Leagha.

¹⁸³ Robinson, *op.cit.*, p.28, §2.

¹⁸⁴ id., p.32, §4.

¹⁸⁵ id., p.33, §5.

time to the daughter of the King of France, is similarly declined¹⁸⁶. In this text France is portrayed as part of a distant world that is rich in chivalry, adventure and romance.

Burgundy also features in *Gyi o Bharbhuic*. In contrast to the other territories visited by Guy, Burgundy is found plundered and devastated¹⁸⁷. This world does not consist solely of tournaments and feasting. Fortunately, in this case, the conflict is terminated by diplomacy.

France is also the setting for one of the episodes in the fragmentary *Bibhus o Hamtuin*¹⁸⁸. The theme of winning a bride is prominent here too; in this instance, however, the maiden who is to wed Bevis has to ward off the advances of a French nobleman. A somewhat unchivalric side of the French nobility is thus revealed.

Saracens

As in *Sdair Fortibrais*, both *Gyi o Bharbhuic* and *Bibhus o Hamtuin* omit the initial S- of 'Saracen'. As has been suggested above, this trait seems to be associated with fifteenth-century works which may perhaps be classified as 'historical romances'¹⁸⁹. Additionally, in *Gyi o Bharbhuic* a distinction is made between Saracens and Turks¹⁹⁰. They are allied against the Christians, but are considered to be separate peoples.

In *Gyi o Bharbhuic*, the hero becomes the protector of Constantinople, which is the only part of the Byzantine Empire which has not been conquered by the Saracen Sultan¹⁹¹. Much of the romance is concerned with the struggle between Guy and the

¹⁸⁶ id., pp.34-5, §7.

¹⁸⁷ id., pp.103-5, §45.

¹⁸⁸ id., pp.296-8, §12.

¹⁸⁹ Note how T.C.D.MS.H.2.7. also contains a copy of *Sdair Fortibrais*, a similar historical romance.

¹⁹⁰ Robinson, *op.cit.*, §19, p.53; §29, p.73.

¹⁹¹ id., §18-9, p.50-1.

Sultan. (This theme would, of course, have been especially topical around the time of the fall of Constantinople in 1453.) In the conflict, the Sultan prays to two gods recognisable as the gods named Termagant and Mahoun in *Sdair Fortibrais* where they are two of the pagan deities destroyed by the Christians trapped in the Tower of Egrimor¹⁹².

In the extant fragment of *Bibhus o Hamtuin* there is little information on the Saracens. They, together with the Jews, are the targets of Bevis in the Holy Land¹⁹³. Although Saracens and Jews are consistently distinguished by name, they do not operate independently. This functional identity, within the operative class of Middle-Eastern infidels, helps to explain the confusion between these two races which were noted in *Sdair Fortibrais*.

Summary

France and the Saracens play a low-key role in these two romances, but they are present as part of the literary backdrop. France is a kingdom where chivalry rules. The places named match those in *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*. The Saracens are the enemy, par excellence, of Christendom, though their name lacks the emotive force that it bore in some other, less 'romantic' texts. As regards the possibility of political interpretations, Guy and Bevis are English heroes whose adventures take them to the Continent. There would be ample scope for national prejudice to surface in the narratives. Its apparent absence confirms that literary considerations are paramount in these texts.

¹⁹²id., §21, p.57 - 'Turgamagunt oculus Mathamhain'. cf *Sdair Fortibrais*; Stokes in *Revue Celtique* 19, p.156, §140.

¹⁹³id., §8, p.289.

This fifteenth-century Arthurian translation is of less immediate importance to the present survey, as it does not directly concern France or the Saracens. However, French nationality is mentioned in the text, and the recovery of the Grail, an important Relic, is a central theme. Its Arthurian milieu and English source set it apart from the Irish 'Matter of France' texts. It may, nevertheless, be said to have contributed to the pool of ideas that make up the 'image' of France in Irish literature; and so, in its own way to the idea of a quest for the Relics.

France

Although France as such is not directly mentioned, all the knights employed in the search for the Holy Grail are French. Lancelot is the son of Ban, King of France¹⁹⁵. The other knights claiming French nationality are Perceval¹⁹⁶, Boos and Lionel¹⁹⁷, and by implication, Galahad. Thus, the French dimension at the Court of King Arthur is made manifest. There is at least the hint of a comparison with the Peers of Charlemagne.

Relics

The central theme of the text is the quest for an important Relic, the Holy Grail, which occupies an important position as a relic from Christ's last days on Earth. Of course, this is not one of the Relics of the Passion rescued by a military campaign, as in the Fierabras story. However, the need to recover the Grail in this text resembles

¹⁹⁴ed.S.Falconer, Dublin, 1953.

¹⁹⁵id., p.62, l.1336.

¹⁹⁶id., p.78, l.1867.

¹⁹⁷id., p.96, l.2489.

the motivation behind the recovery of the Relics of the Passion in *Sdair Fortibrais*, despite the circumstances being very different.

Summary

In this text French knights search for a prized relic from the last days of the life of Christ. Although the King is Arthur and the Relic is the Holy Grail, there are points of contact with *Sdair Fortibrais*. Although *Lorgaireacht an tSoidhigh Naomhtha* is translated from English, it allows French knights to recover the most holy of Christian relics. It would have provided a fifteenth-century Irish reader with an additional perspective on a major Christian topic.

Two Irish Travelogue Translations

*Ser Marco Polo*¹⁹⁸

This Irish translation is an abridgement of the version of the Marco Polo story as found in the Latin translation by Francisco Pipino of the original thirteenth-century French narrative¹⁹⁹. Like *Sdair na Lumbardach*, it is preserved solely in the Book of Lismore, and the translation may date from the later fifteenth century. It recounts the historical journey of Marco Polo to the court of Kublai Khan, during which he passed through a number of countries, including some in which Saracens lived. The glimpses it gives of the Saracens would have supplemented the information which a reader of the Book of Lismore would have obtained from *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* and *Sdair na Lumbardach*.

¹⁹⁸ed.W.Stokes in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 1,1897, pp.245-73, 362-438.

¹⁹⁹id., p.245.

France

France is not mentioned in this text, since Marco Polo's travels take him eastwards from Venice.

Saracens

The most important reference to the Saracens in the *Ser Marco Polo* is when Marco Polo is passing through the Kingdom of Mosul, whose inhabitants, he notes, worship Mohammed. He visits two cities: first the Saracen city of Baghdad, whose wealth he describes in terms of gold and treasures²⁰⁰. He also explains at this point that the overlord of the Saracens is called the 'Calipus', i.e. the Caliph. The second city is Tabriz, whose wealth is described in terms of gems and silk²⁰¹. The Irish reader would thus have learned something about the political geography and wealth of the Saracens in the Middle East as opposed to Spain and Africa, which were better represented in the other texts available.

Ser Marco Polo also tells how the King of the Tartars came to take Baghdad away from the Caliph²⁰², although he only succeeded in taking away some of its riches. The name of this king is to be noted: it was Balan, the same as that of the Admiral in the *Chanson de Fierabras*. Perhaps the literary invader owed his name to the historical one. The same passage also shows the hostility of the Tartars to the Saracens; as seen earlier, the Tartars' final defeat of the Saracens was recorded in the Irish annals.

²⁰⁰ Stokes, *op.cit.*, 1897, p.248, §6.

²⁰¹ *id.*, p.248, §8.

²⁰² *id.*, p.248, §7.

Summary

Although the Saracens are mentioned in this text, they are a passing interest. The main subjects of the text are the Tartars, China and beyond. The reader of this text would have his knowledge of peoples further afield than the Mediterranean world enriched.

*Seon Maundauil*²⁰³

The Irish translation containing the voyages of the fictitious John Mandeville was made in 1475 by one Fingin O'Mahony²⁰⁴. None of the other texts contains such a precise ascription. The translation is extant in two manuscripts, one of them being Egerton 1781, which also contains copies of *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*²⁰⁵. Although the ultimate source text, *Jean de Maundeville*, was composed in French, the translator worked from an English version of the story²⁰⁶. Like Marco Polo, John Mandeville journeyed to the Far East. Even though the voyages of Mandeville are fictitious, they purvey considerably more information about the Saracens than is found in *Ser Marco Polo*.

France and the Relics of the Passion

Seon Maundauil does not refer to the French as a people. However, the opening section, which recounts Mandeville's journey to and arrival in Constantinople, describes in detail the story of the Relics of the Passion. The first sight which the travellers see on arriving in Constantinople is the Hagia Sophia²⁰⁷, where the Holy

²⁰³ ed.W.Stokes in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 2, 1899, pp.1-63, 226-312.

²⁰⁴ id., p.1, referring to p.2, §4. O'Mahony died in 1496.

²⁰⁵ Flower, *op. cit.*, p.526. The portion containing *Seon Maundauil* and *Togail na Tebe* was added to the manuscript in 1487 after the manuscript had been sent North to Breifne.

²⁰⁶ Stokes, *op.cit.*, 1899, p.1.

²⁰⁷ id., p.8, §8.

Sponge is preserved²⁰⁸. Mention of this Relic leads to the description of the others, notably those preserved in France.

According to *Seon Maundauil*, the Holy Cross was made from four types of wood, and bore an inscription in three languages²⁰⁹. The Cross was hidden by the Jews on Mount Calvary, where, two hundred years later, it was discovered by Helena of Britain²¹⁰. This account is a more detailed version of the tradition found in *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, the 'prologue' in Irish of *Sdair Fortibrais*.

The reader is then informed that a piece of the Crown of Thorns was preserved in the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris, along with one of the Nails, the Spearhead, and other Relics which were given to the King of France by, interestingly, the Jews²¹¹. Mandeville himself had seen the portion of the Crown in Paris, and now viewed the portion preserved in Constantinople²¹². This account most closely agrees with the information presented in the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus*, where parts of the Crown are given to Charlemagne in Constantinople.

This description of the Sainte-Chapelle as the resting place of the Relics of the Passion, accords with the description in the *Itinerarium*. Its preservation of the tradition about Helena and the Holy Cross, together with its general emphasis on the importance of Paris as a centre of Christendom, forms a parallel to the facts as presented in *Sdair Fortibrais*.

²⁰⁸ id., p.8, §9.

²⁰⁹ id., pp.8-10, §9-10.

²¹⁰ id., p.12, §12. Note, Helena is described as 'the daughter of the King of England, the old name for which was Great Britain'.

²¹¹ id., p.12, §14.

²¹² id., p.14, §17. Note, it is also stated that the shaft of the Spear is property of the German emperor.

Saracens

The initial S- of 'Saracen' is preserved in this translation, perhaps reflecting the more factual and cosmopolitan ethos of this sort of literature. The Saracens are first met in Cyprus, where Christian and Saracen communities are said to live side by side²¹³. In contrast, the next port of call is Sur in Syria, where a Saracen garrison stands on the site of a destroyed Christian city²¹⁴, ready to resist the crusaders. Here, the old political and religious conflicts are clearly still current in the Middle East.

After passing through the Holy Land, Mandeville arrives at Babylon, the city of the 'Sobhdan' (i.e. Sultan), and then Cairo is reached²¹⁵. The information on these cities and on the Sultan in *Seon Maundaui* resembles that provided by Simon Semeonis. The point is made that the Sultan is the chief ruler of this part of the Saracen world, embracing Egypt, Arabia and Syria²¹⁶. It is mentioned that the Sultan is not universally liked; he wars with the Bedouins of Arabia, and requires Christians to gain special travelling permits. Similar practices are noted by Simon Semeonis.

In the Holy Land, Bethlehem is described as a Christian City, in an area noted for its wine²¹⁷. After the Saracen conquest of the city, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was brought within the line of the city wall of Jerusalem²¹⁸. The Saracens pay a great honour to this church, and Christians need a permit from the Sultan to enter, for fear of members of different Christian sects fighting inside²¹⁹. This again squares with the practical information provided by Simon Semeonis.

²¹³ id., p.26, §37.

²¹⁴ id., p.28, §40.

²¹⁵ id., p.30, §46.

²¹⁶ id., p.32, §47.

²¹⁷ id., p.38, §61.

²¹⁸ id., p.42, §69, a description of all the sights around the Sepulchre where Helena discovered the True Cross is listed, p.44, §74.

²¹⁹ id., p.46, §77-8.

As in the *Itinerarium*, considerable space is devoted to the customs and the religion of the Saracens. For example, the Saracens do not drink wine, or eat pig meat (in Egypt, veal but not beef is eaten)²²⁰. There is an exposition on the Qu'ran, Christ in Islam, Ramadan and the Saracen view of Christianity²²¹. The Sultan tells Mandeville himself that Christianity is evil on account of corrupt priests and such indulgent habits as excessive drinking²²². The Sultan had sent messengers to examine Christian practice, and had himself learned French to be able speak with the Christians²²³, just as Charlemagne is shown to be able to speak Arabic in *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*.

The text also explains that Mohammed was born in Arabia, but came to Christian Egypt as a child. Here, the Archangel Gabriel appeared to him, following which he returned to Arabia as its ruler²²⁴. Mohammed was of the race of Ismael, son of Abraham, whereas a 'true Saracen' is descended from Sara²²⁵. This is the fullest account of the historical origins of Islam and the most precise definition of the term 'Saracen' in medieval Irish literature.

There are two other mentions of the Saracens. The first comes when Mandeville is at the court of Magnus Cam, outside Saracen dominions. Magnus has two hundred Christian and two hundred Saracen physicians, of whom he trusts the Christians more²²⁶. The second is when Mandeville passes through Armenia, a kingdom between Persia and Turkey which is inhabited by both Saracens and Kurds. The capital of this kingdom is Tabriz²²⁷, the city which is characterised as being wealthy in gems and silk in *Ser Marco Polo*. These passages are interesting in that

²²⁰ id., p.40, §61.

²²¹ id., pp.226-36, §115-236.

²²² id., pp.230-32, §123.

²²³ id., p.232, §124.

²²⁴ id., p.234, §125-6.

²²⁵ id., p.234, §127. The Saracens are divided into four groups, all descended from Abraham; the True Saracens, the Ismaelites, the Hagarenes and the Ammonites.

²²⁶ id., p.270, §208.

²²⁷ id., p.280, §228.

they portray the Saracens as living in multicultural, pluralist societies. As to Tabriz, it had indeed become the leading centre of trade in the Middle East by the fifteenth century²²⁸.

Summary

Although much of *Seon Maundauil* is similar in subject matter to *Ser Marco Polo*, its introductory section contains additional information about the Holy Land, Christian/Saracen differences, and some important details about the Relics of the Passion. The reader of *Seon Maundauil* would have his information on the Relics, perhaps gleaned from *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* and *Sdair Fortibrais*, confirmed and extended. He would also learn more about the Saracens in their original homeland, information which had previously only been related in the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis. *Seon Maundauil* is, amongst other things, a highly informative text, presenting information about many subjects.

References in Bardic Verse (and Romantic Tales)

Beyond the realm of Annals and Translations two other literary genres are of interest to the present enquiry: bardic verse and romantic tales. References in bardic verse could be especially valuable if ascribed to a named poet, whose dates may have been recorded in the manuscripts or annals²²⁹, or if addressed to a certain patron, where again the possibility of precise dating exists.

²²⁸ For the importance of Tabriz in the later Middle Ages, see J.W.Clinton, 'Tabriz' in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 11, New York, 1988, pp.570-1 along with attached bibliography.

²²⁹ As a specimen of a late fourteenth-century manuscript containing bardic poems, see L.McKenna, *Aithdioghluim Dána*, Irish Texts' Society vol. 37, Dublin, 1939 - an edition of poems from the Yellow Book of Lecan, and a discussion of the authors.

Unfortunately, the extant corpus of bardic poetry from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries contains few substantial references to France and the Relics of the Passion, and none to the Saracens. However, a small number of passing references occur, and are worth mentioning because they offer a different perspective in the subjects under discussion.

The surviving romantic tales are generally preserved in manuscripts from the seventeenth century or later²³⁰ and are usually anonymous²³¹. Although it seems probable that such tales were being composed during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries²³², the direct evidence is slight. Even where the three subjects are mentioned, there is hence a difficulty about relating them to the undoubtedly fifteenth-century sources.

Luckily, the subjects under consideration do not play an important role in the romantic tales. France is used as a setting for episodes in the tales, just like Spain, Germany, Italy and England²³³. Classical sources provided the names for countries of the Eastern Mediterranean, including Egypt and Greece²³⁴. Other kingdoms such as Persia, Arabia and Babylon, which were associated with the Saracens in certain other branches of the literary tradition, do not appear commonly in the earliest romantic tales²³⁵. Where they do occur, the descriptions of Eastern Geography have a vague, almost exotic nature. An important exception is *Sechrán na Banimpire*²³⁶, whose references to Charlemagne and the Saracens could well have been inspired by *Sdair Fortibrais*, on account of certain textual correspondences²³⁷.

²³⁰ A.Bruford, 'Gaelic Folktales and Medieval Romances' in *Béalóideas* 34, 1966, pp.5 & 70.

²³¹ *id.*, p.45.

²³² *id.*, p.46.

²³³ *id.*, p.21.

²³⁴ *ibid.*

²³⁵ *ibid.*

²³⁶ ed.C.Marstrander, *Ériu* 5, 1911, pp.161-99, from R.I.A. Stowe B.IV.1. (late seventeenth century).

²³⁷ *id.*, pp.162-3 notes these parallels briefly.

The general scarcity of references to the Saracens and to the Relics of the Passion, and the relative insignificance of France, show that these subjects were of little real importance to majority of the composers of the romantic tales. Because of their marginal incidence, and because most references are vague and derivative, the romantic tales are not considered in any further detail here. Some of the references in bardic poetry are worth mentioning, however, as they contain more precise references to France and the Relics of the Passion.

France

An early reference to France is found in a poem composed around 1300 for Fearghal mac Dhomhaill O Raghallaigh²³⁸. In this poem, the company of men around Fearghal is likened to the wine of France²³⁹. Here, the simile conjures up a powerful image of opulence. Wine was an esteemed commodity with which France was associated at this time; a considerable quantity of wine was imported from Bordeaux for drinking in the British Isles.

Later in the fourteenth century, the Munster poet Gofraidh Fionn O Dálaigh (†1387), in a poem for Maurice Fitzmaurice, second Earl of Desmond (†1358), describes how Maurice travels with his patron, the King of England, to France²⁴⁰. France is portrayed as a rich and beautiful land, whose wealth includes an abundance of wine, as in the previous poem²⁴¹. Maurice also learns the 'lore' of France; to the Irish bardic poet learning was praiseworthy in a chief, and Gofraidh lets us know in the by-going that France was a civilised place by the criterion of learning²⁴².

²³⁸ ed.J.Carney in *Poems on the O'Reillys*, Dublin, 1950, pp.106-14.

²³⁹ id., p.110, stanza 10, l.2562.

²⁴⁰ ed.D.Greene & F.Kelly, Dublin, 1970, p73 ff.

²⁴¹ id., p.75, stanza 12.

²⁴² id., p.75, stanza 13.

The first fifteenth-century example is an elegy by Tadhg Og O hUiginn (†1478) on James Butler (†1452), the White Earl of Ormond²⁴³. One of the major events of Butler's life was his expedition to France with Henry V, as recorded in the Irish Annals. Although Butler was engaged in a long-running feud with John Talbot over the royal government in Ireland²⁴⁴, his loyalty to the King of England against France, was obviously not in doubt. To the bardic poet the loyalties of his subject are usually played down for ideological and conventional reasons; but the fact of this expedition could not be overlooked, and O hUiginn refers to Butler's martial prowess in France in the most glowing terms²⁴⁵.

A final, but important reference to France is made in an elegy for James Purcell (†1456)²⁴⁶. In the course of this poem, Purcell is described as being a Frenchman ('Francach')²⁴⁷. This was an acceptable way of describing a member of one of the sean-Ghall families: it was factual enough in the case of those incomers whose people had come originally from Normandy. It is interesting to note that in a case like this there was no stigma attacking French origin: nobility was the prime consideration.

Saracens

The bardic poets and their patrons lived through, and in some cases took part in the crusades, as two thirteenth-century poems clearly composed in the Eastern Mediterranean testify²⁴⁸. However, the extant corpus of published bardic verse contains no explicit reference to the Saracens.

²⁴³ ed.L.McKenna, *op.cit.*, vol.1, p.139 ff.

²⁴⁴ K.Simms in R.G.Foster (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland*, Oxford, 1989, pp.95-6.

²⁴⁵ McKenna, *op.cit.*, pp.141-2, stanzas 16-20.

²⁴⁶ ed.A.O'Sullivan in *Poems on the Marcher Lords*, Irish Text Society vol.53, Dublin, 1987, pp.22-43.

²⁴⁷ *id.*, p.24, stanzas 10-1.

²⁴⁸ ed.G.Murphy in *Éigse* 7, 1953-5, pp.71-9. The first poem is by Giolla Brigde Albanach, the second most likely by Muireadhach Albanach Ó Dálaigh.

Relics

Tadhg Og O hUiginn is the earliest classical bardic poet to refer to the Relics of the Passion. This reference occurs in a poem to the Holy Cross preserved in the Yellow Book of Lecan²⁴⁹. A large portion of the text is devoted to the story of Helen's discovery of the True Cross after being shown its miraculous powers of restoring life²⁵⁰. The Jews are blamed for hiding the Cross, and its recovery by the Christians is said to be inevitable.

An even more detailed account of the True Cross and its discovery by Helen is contained in a poem by Philip Bocht O hUiginn (†1487)²⁵¹. This poem also contains references to the other relics of the Passion: the Nails, a Thorn and the Lance. Their relationship to the Cross is outlined, and the reader is left in no doubt as to the importance of each Relic.

Summary

In the bardic verse of the fourteenth century France can figure as a far-off, wealthy land, but no diplomatic and political ideas surface. In the fifteenth century, the war of England (supported by many from Ireland) with France was a long-standing fact of life. ~~There was~~, however, genealogical awareness that Norman nobles were ultimately of French stock; ~~but~~ at the genealogical level there were no nationalistic or chauvinistic connotations to being 'French'.

The Relics of the Passion appear in the poems of the fifteenth century, at a date after the translation of *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* and *Gesta Karoli Magni* into Irish.

²⁴⁹ ed.L.McKenna in *Dan Dé*, Dublin, 1922, pp.4-6.

²⁵⁰ id., stanzas 23-31.

²⁵¹ ed.L.MacKenna in *Dánta Philip Bhoicht*, Dublin, 1931, pp.20-5.

These poems, however, are of a religious nature, and their devotional concerns have little room for geographical or historical elaboration. Nothing is learned about France, or the Saracens in classical bardic verse.

Résumé

There is extant a fairly small corpus of writing about France, the Saracens and the Relics of the Passion in both Hiberno-Latin and Irish, extending in date from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. There is a certain consistency in the information that they provide on these subjects. The Annals, which cover the entire time scale of the later Middle Ages, refer in the thirteenth century to the hostility between Christians and Saracens over the Holy Land and the Relics of the Passion. France becomes more prominent later on, when the hostility between England and France becomes a concern of the Annals during the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. The major events of the wars are reported as factual events, and do not show any obvious bias. However it is notable that France undergoes an image-shift: for the most part thirteenth-century references to France are concerned to represent a united Christian front against the Saracens, whereas in the later centuries France generally represents a country that is opposed to the King of England.

The earliest narrative text considered, the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis, portrays France as a Christian centre and Egypt as the centre of Saracen and Muslim power. Similarities between some of the descriptions in the *Itinerarium* and *Gesta Karoli Magni* indicate that the two texts were composed by like-minded authors who were concerned to bring information about France, the Saracens and the Relics of the Passion to the clerical communities of Ireland²⁵². Their early fourteenth-century date

²⁵²Chapter Five, Section Two, asks whether it could be Simon Semeonis himself who translated the *Chanson de Fierabras* into Irish.

of composition suggests that their aim was to glorify the crusading ideals of the thirteenth century.

Sdair Fortibrais and *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* present the wars between France and the Saracens to a fifteenth-century Irish audience. *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* appears as history and provides the reader with much factual information. The principal purpose of *Sdair Fortibrais* was to demonstrate how the Relics of the Passion ended up in Paris. In effect, the enemies of the Christians are simply 'the pagans', the term 'Saracen' having lost its importance after the era of the major crusades. The French hold centre stage throughout, and it may be that a contemporary Gaelic-Irish audience would have seen the English as the 'pagan' invaders of France, or of Ireland.

The 'Matter of Britain' romances present France as a land of Christian chivalry. The Normans, by implication, forge a link between the predominantly French Arthurian knights and the contemporary Anglo-Irish nobility. The Saracens are the enemy, but as in *Sdair Fortibrais* they lack the historical clarity of depiction that they were given by the thirteenth-century annalists. What matters is the Christian quest, a universal theme in the romantic literature of the time.

In translations dating from the later fifteenth century, more factual concerns reappear. *Sdair na Lumbardach* gives much information about the history of the empire of Charlemagne and the rise of Mohammed that was new in Irish. The late fifteenth-century travelogues considerably increased the range of knowledge about the geography and culture of the Orient. In particular, *Seon Maundauil* went further than the *Itinerarium* in describing the Relics in Paris, the Islamic religion, and such places as Saracen Egypt and Israel. Perhaps the upsurge in printed literature fuelled demand for informative literature in Ireland as elsewhere in Europe. At all events the texts

listed above gave the Irish reader a considerable range of information concerning the history of France and the Middle East.

The question whether these texts may have been created, or at least read, as political 'romans à clef' is a difficult one. In general the existence of such sub-texts remains unproven. However, a late fourteenth or early fifteenth-century Irish reader could well have identified with the French heroes of the literary texts and seen the English of his own day as re-enacting in Ireland the Saracen incursions into France. While it would be hard to deny the possibility of such a reading of these texts, it would be another matter to suggest this was a primary function. The desire to be entertained, and historical and geographical curiosity, were more potent and lasting motivations among those who asked for these texts to be written.

CHAPTER FOUR***GESTA KAROLI MAGNI - THE FRENCH SOURCE
AND IRISH DERIVATIVE*****SECTION ONE*****SDAIR FORTIBRAIS - AN IRISH TRANSLATION OF
GESTA KAROLI MAGNI***

It has been taken as evident that *Sdair Fortibrais* bears a close relationship to *Gesta Karoli Magni*, while noting at least one discrepancy, the failure to distinguish between Saracens and Jews in *Sdair Fortibrais*. It is now necessary to examine in more detail the relationship between the two texts. To anticipate, it will be demonstrated that the Irish text is a translation of the Latin. It is worth stating at the outset that there are no external or general grounds for excluding other relationships, such as a shared original, or a translation from Irish into Latin.

Gesta Karoli Magni will be identified as the source of *Sdair Fortibrais* in two ways: first, by listing a set of passages where the text of *Sdair Fortibrais* follows that of *Gesta Karoli Magni* in a manner that a direct connection is undeniable; second, by scrutiny of a set of passages of *Gesta Karoli Magni* that are omitted, or drastically reduced, in the Irish text, but where a rationale for their reduction or omission can be discerned. The upshot of this investigation will be the conclusion that *Sdair Fortibrais* is an 'economical' translation of *Gesta Karoli Magni* in the sense that it applies a deliberate policy of abbreviating certain categories of material, but otherwise follows its source accurately and closely.

The Irish extracts are taken from the 1898 edition of *Sdair Fortibrais* by W. Stokes¹. This edition was made from only three of the manuscripts containing *Sdair Fortibrais*². However, inspection of the other manuscripts has demonstrated quite sufficiently that they do not deviate in any significant way from the text printed by Stokes³. The paragraph numbering of Stoke's edition of *Sdair Fortibrais* is followed in the present work, despite the fact that his principles of paragraph division are sometimes hard to follow. The extant portion of the Latin text corresponds to the first 145 of the 258 paragraphs in Stokes's edition.

The task of demonstrating the relationship between *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gesta Karoli Magni* is begun by presenting a set of passages designed to represent a fair cross-section of the text: the first and last paragraphs (using Stokes's division of *Sdair Fortibrais*, as explained above), together with five further paragraphs taken as regular intervals throughout the body of the text⁴. This sample adequately illuminates the relationship between the extant portions of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the corresponding sections of *Sdair Fortibrais*: a combination of close translation of the essential narrative with the omission of non-essential detail. A further selection of passages will then be considered, with the intention of further investigating the basis on which the author of *Sdair Fortibrais* departed from his source. It will appear that he deliberately and consistently eliminated certain classes of what he regarded as non-essential details.

¹ W. Stokes in *Revue Celtique* 19, 1898, pp.14-57, 118-67, 252-91, 364-93.

² *id.*, p.14.

³ This inspection was done during the editing of *Gesta Karoli Magni*, using the list of manuscripts of *Sdair Fortibrais* compiled by R. Flower in *A Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum* vol.2, London, 1926, p.527, and also by using T.C.D. MS.H.2.17, not noticed by Flower. The inspection involved the examination of selected passages of the unedited texts, including those with a distinctive piece of description or list of names, and their comparison with the edited text.

⁴ This adds up to about 1/20 of the text as a whole.

Selected Paragraphs of *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gesta Karoli Magni*

1.

[§1]⁵ Sicut apud Sanctum Dyonisium inter cetera gesta scriptis reperitur. Post obdormitionem in domino bone memorie venerabilis Helenae matris Constantini imperatoris quae crucem domini nostri Ihesu Christi cum corona ceterisque reliquiis sanctorum tanquam pia sancte ecclesie filia Ierosolimis deportavit a Iudeis cruce divisa per partes et ad diversa loca <.....> per piam devotionem beate ecclesie oblatas, tandem corona cum clavis ceterisque reliquiis pontifici Romano Rome erant oblate.

[§1]⁶ Apud Sanctum Dionisium .i. do-ghabtar ac Sin Denis. 'Ar testail na mna diadha so .i. Elena máthair Constantín impir neoch tuc in croch naom o Iubalaibh a cathraigh Elena 7 ar lecin na croiche naime uatha doibh tangadur fan Roim, 7 rugadur leo in coroin spine maille tairrngedhaibh na croiche 7 re taissibh na naem on papa Romanach.

The opening paragraph of *Sdair Fortibrais* preserves the main ideas of *Gesta Karoli Magni*, although in a condensed and somewhat confused form. The reader is not sure exactly who is carrying the Relics off from Rome (when they should be being distributed at this stage): it almost seems as though the Jews are meant. The first three words of *Sdair Fortibrais* indicates that the Latin was the source text, and their presence in *Gesta Karoli Magni* is clearly no coincidence.

2.

[§25]⁷ Cui Oliverus "Hec est iactantia meroris non valoris ex quo creatorem tuum vilipendisti. Surge propere, arma te quia facinus quod Christo infecisti in te vindicabo, et nisi citius te armaveris, ista lancea te perforabo."

⁵*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 85, column 1, l.1-10. Note, the square brackets are used in the edition of *Gesta Karoli Magni* to indicate the start of the paragraph.

⁶Stokes, *op.cit.*, pp.10-2.

⁷*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 87, column 1, l.48-9; column 2, l.1-4.

[§25]⁸ Ocus adubairt Oliverus "Eirigh go luath, 7 gabh t'airm cugad, oir is adhbúr dod laidiugud a n-abrai, 7 ní hadhbúr dod mhétugud, oir gach ní do-rínnis ar Crist tairfidsa ort é, 7 mana glaicair t'airm go luath gonfat do thaebh don tsleigh so."

A close translation, although the phrase 'iactantia meroris non valoris' does not appear to have been understood properly. Note the preservation of the Latin nominative ending in the name 'Oliverus', suggesting a Latin source⁹.

3.

[§49]¹⁰ Hoc facto proiecit barellos in quodam fluvio ne paganus gustaret ut prius fecerat si contingeret eum in posterum plagari. Barelli vero illi in vigilia nativitatís Iohannis Baptiste quolibet anno natant ultra aquam, miraculose cum sint magni ponderis ex auro et lapidibus pretiosis et diversis circumornati. Fortibras autem ista videns dolens et commotus, ait Olivero "Graviter ista lues."

[§49]¹¹ Ocus mar do-rinne sin do theile urchar díbh uadha isin sruth innus nach fuighbedh in paghanach iat da tecmad co loitfidh he; 7 snaidhid na búideil sin gacha aidhce feil t-san Seain ar in sruth sin, innus nacharb eitir a chreidimain acht le mirbuilbh móra co snaimidis 7 a truime d'or 7 do legaibh uáisle 7 do cumdach imda do-bhí ina timcell. Ocus mur do-chonnuic Fortibrais gur cuireadh na buideil isin sruth dobo cruaidh leis é, 7 do-bhuaidhredh co mór é, 7 adubairt re hOliver "is trom ícfair son."

An interesting translation into Irish. The initial ablative absolute is translated using a main verb. The Latin 'quodam fluvius' corresponds idiomatically with the Irish 'in sruth'. In order to bring out the full meaning of the Latin, 'miraculose' is expanded to 'innus nacharb eitir a chreidimain acht le mirbuilbh móra'. 'Ista videns' is also expanded to 'gur cuireadh na buideil isin sruth' for clarity, whereas 'ista lues' is closely

⁸Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.28.

⁹Throughout *Sdair Fortibrais*, the principal characters are called by their Latin name, although the names are only found in the nominative case. These names will be discussed in the next section, and a complete list appears in Appendix Two.

¹⁰*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 89, column 2, 1.9-18.

¹¹Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.40.

translated. Note the translation of the name 'Iohannis' to 'Sean', an example of translation which occurs with certain names; however, the translation is unusual, as 'Éoin' would be the more usual form.

4.

[§73]¹² Imperator vero viscerose compatiens iussit barones suos ut suaviter sisterent eum super suum clipeum. Ad cuius iussum confestim paraverunt barones et posuerunt eum leviter super regis scutum. Et sic portaverunt eum ad lignum elevatum pro signo. Et cum fuisset quietus in lecto, accurrerunt undique Galli ut eum videant admirantes decorem corporis eius et venustatem.

[§73]¹³ Ocus tainic craidhe in impir air, 7 do-furail a imcar co fosaidh ara sgiath fen, 7 do-imcradar don dunadh é, 7 mur do-chuired ina leabaid é tangadur na Cristaidi da fechain, 7 dob ingnadh aille a chuirp 7 a aesmurach fen.

A somewhat shortened translation: the second sentence of the Latin repeats the information of the first and is thus omitted in the Irish text. Note the translation of 'ad lignum elevatum pro signo' merely by 'don dunadh'.

5.

[§97]¹⁴ Quod audientes barones gavisí sunt gaudio magno. Oliverus grato vultu respondit "Domina in nullo oportet vobis timere quin te parebimus usque ad mortem pro voluntate vestra complenda, cum tempus sit et locus."

[§97]¹⁵ Ocus mar do-chualadar na ridiri sin do-ghab gairdechus mór iad, 7 do-frecair Oliverus di, 7 adubairt "A ingen, na gabad ecla thu ima chend sin, 7 madh ecin duinne bas d'fadhbaill ac comlinadh th'inntinne in uair bus trath di aentochamaid let."

¹²*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 92, column 1, 1.48-9; column 2, 1.1-7.

¹³Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.54.

¹⁴*Gesta Karoli Magni*, p.95, column 1, 1.30-5.

¹⁵Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.130.

A reasonably close translation, with a short elaboration at the end, which serves to highlight the message of the speech. The Irish passage is written using favoured Irish idioms where the Latin text has favoured Latin ones; note the conversion of the Latin present participle of the first clause into an Irish main verb, and the translation of 'parebimus' as 'áentóchamaid'. It can also be asked if the phrase 'timere quin' was understood properly. Note the omission of the description of the face of Oliver in the translation.

6.

[§121]¹⁶ Illa vero conversa ad milites, quasi impatiens dixit eis "Vassalli ascendatis interim." Dux vero Reimerus "Quis unquam tam pulcrum dominam vidit? Multum posset gaudere, qui ipsius benevolentiam posset acquirere." Et Rolandus "Nunquam vidi tam decoram dominam. Quis dyabolus instigat te de dominabus nunc cogitare? Nichil loqui eo quod capilli tui fiunt cani." Et Reimerus "Quia miles sum et incumbit militi talia loqui." Floripes vero hoc audiens vultu placito dixit "Ista omittantur, non enim duxi vos huc ut sit aliqua contentio, sed mutuum solatium."

[§121]¹⁷ Ocus ruc le iat mara rabudur na ridiri ele annsa tor, 7 adubairt Nemerus "An facaidh enduine agaibh ríam ben budh aille ina in ben so, oir dobo ghar don duine do fétfadh a toíl do comlinadh." Ocus adubairt Rolandus "ní fhacusa riam ben budh aille na sí. Ocus is e an díabul doba ort, 7 do chend ar líathad, a bheith ac techt tar na mnaibh anois." Ocus adubairt Nemerus "Ni hedh, acht ridire me, 7 dligim a lethid sud do rada." Mar do-chualaidh Floripes íat, adubairt ríu "Léigidh sin uaibh, oir ní cuigi tucus lium sibh cunnco mbeth cointinn agaibh acht do bheth subachus."

The Irish text provides fuller 'stage directions', but then omits unaccountably the command of Floripes. The Irish translator has substituted the comparative 'aille' for both 'tam pulcrum' and 'tam decorum', replaced 'benevolentiam acquirere' by 'a toíl a comlinadh', and translated 'Quis dyabolus instigat te' idiomatically by 'Ocus is e an díabul doba ort'. However, the translation of Reimer's speech is very close as the

¹⁶*Gesta Karoli Magni*, p.98, column 1, l.37-49.

¹⁷Stokes, *op.cit.*, pp.144-6.

sentiment is somewhat strange in Irish - 'acht ridire me, agus dligim a lethid sud do rada'.

7.

[§145]¹⁸ Clarion rex nepos Admirandi unus de valentioribus paganis associatis sibi xv mille occurrit eis. Rolandus vero obvians Geimper regi ictu gladii sui vocabolo Durendal ipsum dissecuit usque ad zonam. Guido videns Clarionem cum tanto impetu procedere direxit se ad eum. Ad quem paganus sagittam unam proiciens, Guidonis equum interfecit. <....> (end of extant text).

[§145]¹⁹ Tainic annsin Clarion cuigi .i. mac mic do Adhmirannus, v míli déc d'Iubhalaibh, 7 is é dob ferr d'Iubhalaibh acht Admirandus, 7 tarra Rolandus doibh, 7 tuc búille do claidhem docum rígh acu durub ainm Gibér, 7 do-sgoilt conuige a chris é, 7 do-chonnuic é Clarion 7 dasacht mór air, 7 do-dheisigh cuige é, 7 do-theilc in paganach soighid ris, 7 tarra si in each Sir Gido 7 do-mharb í, 7(continues).

The translation of this final passage is fairly close; note the omission of the name of the sword of Roland. The translation of 'nepos' as 'mac mic' does not seem the most likely, although this would be a dictionary definition. However, the translator has made an interesting attempt at 'unus de valentioribus paganis' with the idiomatic 'is é dob ferr d'Iubhalaibh acht'. Note also the idiomatic 'v míli déc d'Iubhalaibh' (15000 strong) for 'associatis sibi xv mille'.

¹⁸*Gesta Karoli Magni*, p.100, column 2, l.41-5.

¹⁹Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.158.

Omissions from *Sdair Fortibrais* - Some Illustrative Examples

The following series of larger-scale omissions and reductions of *Gesta Karoli Magni* in *Sdair Fortibrais* show that the Irish translator was willing to cut out material which he felt was not of importance for the narrative. As with the words and phrases omitted above, so on the larger scale certain descriptive passages are omitted, as are some passages that repeat information provided in earlier paragraphs.

1.

(§15)²⁰ Accinxit se gladio vocabulo Hauteclere, ascendens dextrarium Ferrant de Hispania et prae agilitate non tangens <...>ona selle dehinc pendebat ad collum clipeum decenter decoratum. [§16] Cingens se zona aurea signo crucis se muniendo ut miles inclitus absque pavore astringens lanceam pugno, dextrario subivit calcaria ad praesentiamque Karoli festinans.

(§15) - [§16] ²¹Ocus do-dheísigh Oliverus é fen dochum in catha ocus do-chuaidh mar a roibe an t-imper.

The Irish translator has not felt it necessary to include the details of the armour of Oliver. This omission changes the literary aesthetic of the text, and speeds up the narrative.

2.

(§20)²² "Vadet in Christi nomine." Gindeleon autem susurru veredixit ad Herdre "Nunquam redeat vita comiti." Imperator vero in signum licentie cirotecam suam Olivero commendavit.

²⁰*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 86, column 2, l.7-16. Note, the paragraph number in rounded brackets indicates that this sentence is not the start of the paragraph, but taken from that paragraph.

²¹Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.24. The square brackets show that this sentence is the first in that paragraph: see note 11.

²²*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 87, column 1, l.13-7.

(§20)²³ ..., oculus imdigh í n-ainm Crist." Oculs tuc a lamann dó mar comartha cetaigthe.

The whisper has been viewed as an unnecessary interjection. That Ganelon is acting maliciously has already been discussed in §19 and §20²⁴.

3.

(§33)²⁵ Cui Fortibras "Nichil vituperabile in te video non sed pugnare volo cum tam exili persona, ne imputaretur pro obprobrio. Rogo pro militia tua quod facias votum meum vel quaeras Rolandum vel Oliverum vel Ogerum vel aliquem nobilem ne nobilitas mea vilificetur. Vel veniant contra me duo vel tres de validioribus, quia honorificum est certare cum talibus."

(§33)²⁶ Oculs adubairt Fortibras "Ní faicim ingotha gurub tu, ach nach ail lium comrac re persain anuasail."

The French nobles have been discussed in §27 and §28²⁷. The challenge of Fortibras was made earlier in §4²⁸. There was no need to repeat either section.

4.

[§39]²⁹ Fortibras autem ostendens sibi tres mucrones dicit "Ecce tres isti gladii apparati. Unus nominatur Plorante. Secundus nominatur Bapteym. Tertius Graban. Raro in teris meliores reperientur. Tres vero germani fabri ferarii fuerunt, vocabolo Golians, Munificas, Agrifax. In terris subtiliores non fuerunt. Golians fabricavit Hautecler, Joyus, Fortbrige. Munificans fabricavit Durindal, Sanguine, Curtem.

²³Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.26.

²⁴*ibid.*

²⁵*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 88, column 1, l.1-8.

²⁶Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.32.

²⁷*id.*, p.30.

²⁸*id.*, p.18.

²⁹*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 88, column 1, l.43-9; column 2, l.1-7.

Arifaxat fabricavit Bapteyme, Plorans, Graban. Istos tres semper mecum produco. Duo vero pendent ad sellam, tertio sum accinctus ad bellandum."

[§39]³⁰ Ocus do-thaisben Fortibras tri cloidme d'Oliverus, ocus adubairt ris nach roibe a talamh tri cloidme dob fer na iat .i. Ploranti ocus Babten ocus Garban a n-anmanna, "ocus tri derbraithreacha do-rinne iat, ocus bit siad do-ghnath agumsa ar imchur .i. a da dhibh fam oscaill ocus in tres claidhem tarum³¹."

The complete list in the Latin shows the relationship between the Christian and Saracen swords of Charlemagne, Roland, Oliver and Fierabras. Although the Irish literary taste ran to antiquarian excursions and learned glosses, this information was somewhat *récherché* in terms of the Fierabras story itself. In fact this omission is reminiscent of the truncation of a list in *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*³². For in §3 of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, a list is provided of the names of all the towns in Spain that were captured by Charlemagne. The Irish translator has dispensed with this list with disarming frankness: on account of the 'difficulties of pronunciation of these barbarous names'³³. To those translators antiquarian embellishments were unnecessary; at least in imported texts.

5.

(§55)³⁴ "Laudo ergo ut deneges baptismum tuum et fidem tuam et credas deo meo et tibi coniugabo sororem meam cum regno Francie ceterisque regnis quae subiugabuntur et regnabis prae ceteris regibus cum honore."

(§55)³⁵ "Ocus cuirsi druim red bhaistedh ocus red chreidem, ocus posfat rit í maille tigernus mór."

³⁰Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.34.

³¹Note how 'ad sella' is translated by 'fam oscaill'; the translator thinks of these swords as daggers attached to Fierabras's side.

³²ed.D.Hyde, Irish Texts Society vol.19, Dublin, 1917.

³³id., p.8. "Cuid d'anmannaibh na cathrach do ghabh Serlus isin Spain leicim thoram iat ar decrach na n-anmann mbarbardha do radh."

³⁴*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 90, column 1, l.35-9.

³⁵Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.44.

The denial of baptism is enough; the conversion to paganism follows automatically. The incidental details of this promise of land are irrelevant; a special place of honour is deemed to follow from the marriage of the king's daughter.

6.

(§70)³⁶ Unde non paucis ex parte paganorum interemptis velocius fugerunt producentes cum eis Oliverum graviter vulneratum, et comitem Bernardum, et comitem Gylmerum stricte ligatos. Barones vero illos attingere nequibant. Item capti sunt: Galfrigus comes pernobilis de Antegania et Auberus et Gerarinus et cum ceteris sunt adducti.

(§70)³⁷ Ocus ní mór dona barburachaibh do-mharbad ansin do-bhí da fheabhus do-theichidur. Ocus do-ghabadar ansin Sefre ocus Amberus íarladha uaisle, ocus rucadur leo iat maille na cétbráighdich.

As the translation implies, the first group (cétbráighdich) of prisoners have already been named in §67 and §68³⁸.

7.

(§81)³⁹ "Vade festinater praepara mihi tela ignita et ligari fortiter fac istos ut statim confodiantur ad columpnas aule marmoreas in praesentia mea."

(§81)⁴⁰ "Ullmaig tendte dam ocus cengailter in fedhan ud dam da milled."

This extract is an abridgement; the translator does not dwell on the precise details of the torture to be inflicted upon the French knights.

³⁶*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 92, column 1, l.13-20.

³⁷Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.52.

³⁸*ibid.*

³⁹*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 93, column 1, l.25-8.

⁴⁰Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.120.

8.

(§93)⁴¹ "Iste est Oliverus filius Reymeri comitis pronobilis cuius filia elucida perpulcra inter omnes mulieres terre ipsa soror Oliveri qui iam devincit Fortibras fratrem tuum et interfecit. Ille sodalis est Bernardus tantum in probitatibus commendatus. Tertius est nobilis Gylmerus Scotus. Quartus est inclitus Galfridus."

(§93)⁴² "Oir is e so Oliverus mac do Nemerus íarla, ocus is leis do-chloidhedh do bhraithirsi .i. Fortibras." Ocus do-innis gach nech acu fo leth,"

In the Latin text, the names of all the knights are related, showing that the speaker knows each one of them. However the reader already knows the names of the knights, so a short phrase can replace the direct speech. This same pattern is repeated in §96⁴³ (which has not been printed here).

9.

(§102)⁴⁴ Quibus rex impatienter respondit "Et vos simul ibitis, et dicetis Admirando, quod se convertat ad fidem Christi, et solvat mihi tributa de terris omnibus quas detinet, et quod mittat mihi Coronam Ihesu Christi cum ceteris reliquiis quas eripuit quando occidit Papam Rome, et quod remittat mihi inclitos meos. Sin autem veniam et mediantibus gladiis auferam sibi omnia regna sua. Et ipsum tradam vili morte necandum. Et super hiis iras meas vobiscum deferetis sibi tradendas."

(§102)⁴⁵ Ocus adubairt san co fergach "Racha sibsi uile leo ocus beridh mo litrichasa libh arna gnothaidib cuirim libh, ocus tabraidh do Admirandus iat."

This speech of Charles merely reinforces what he has already stated in §99⁴⁶. It is underlining the reasons for the original embassy both for the knights and the readers.

⁴¹*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 94, column 2, l.28-35.

⁴²Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.128.

⁴³*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 95, column 1; Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.130.

⁴⁴*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 95, column 2, l.26-36.

⁴⁵Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.132.

⁴⁶*ibid.*

However it is basically just a repetition, and unnecessary to the narrative. Note how the translator contains the idea that Charles's demands were contained in a letters, and were not to be delivered orally.

10.

(§104)⁴⁷ Eodem vero tempore Admirandus rex vocavit ad xv. reges barbaros. Illis stantibus coram Admirando, Moradas primus de nobilioribus barbaris dixit regi "Domine ad quid coram vobis nos vocasti?" Cui Admirandus

(§104)⁴⁸ Do-bhí sin aimser tuc Admirandus .u. righe déc do barburachaibh cuice, ocus adubairt riu

The little speech by Moradas seems to be nothing more than a rhetorical device. At least that is what the translator appears to have thought, with the result that he omitted it and streamlined the passage.

11.

(§105)⁴⁹ Et dux Reimerus "Ego tibi occurram libenti animo." Et Moradas "Stulte loqueris quia si tales .v. sicut et tu mihi occurrerent, viliter illos prosternerem." Et ait ad socios suos "Ne moveamini. Ego vincam illos Christianos, et victos praesentabo Admirando."

(§105)⁵⁰ Ocus adubairt Nemerus "Rachudsa cugut, oir da tighedh .x. mur tu cugumsa do-bherainn bas doibh." Ocus adubairt rena chompanachaibh gan techt leis ocus co claidhfed fen iat.

⁴⁷*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 95, column 2, l.45-9.

⁴⁸Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.132.

⁴⁹*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 96, column 1, l.25-30.

⁵⁰Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.134.

The narrative has been altered by an omission. The two speeches have been run together in the Irish translation, giving the boasting to the French knight. Note the larger number that could be fought by the French knight. Perhaps five opponents seemed too small for the translator. Note also how the Latin phrase 'libenti animo' has been omitted: this adverbial colouring of emotion is often cut out in the translation.

12.

[§110]⁵¹ Omnes vero perterriti suspirantes dixerunt "Heu qualiter possumus evadere omnia haec pericula transeundo?" Rolandus vero illos confortans dixit "Nichil timeamus. Ego vero deo annuente de ianitore vos liberabo." Cui dux Reimerus "Tu dabis unum ictum ut recipias viginti. Procedeamus caute in factum nostris. Vincamus eos per verba ficta et adulatoria."

[§110]⁵² Ocus mar do-chualadur na ridiri sin adubrudur co hacaintech "A Dhia", ar siad, "Cinnus rachmuid tar in guasacht sin?" Ocus adubairt Nemerus "Na gabad ecla sibh, ocus mad ail le Dia, bermaidne tarrsu sud sibh le briathraibh ceilge."

The omission of the little speech of Roland is compensated for by the inclusion of the content in the speech of Nemer, although this speech has had its opening caveat omitted in translation. The result here is also a streamlining of the narrative.

13.

(§116)⁵³ Tunc dixit Ricardus dux Normannie "Karolus imperator tibi mandat, ut mittas sibi coronam Ihesu cum reliquiis una cum militibus suis indempnis. Et si non, tu eris membratim dilaceratus." Tirri vero dux Arderne vultu horibili, superciliis suis inclinatis. ----- Tirri dixit "Mittatis festinanter reliquias cum militibus sanis et salvis domino imperatori. Aut eris vilissime suspensus."

⁵¹*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 96, column 2, l.43-9.

⁵²Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.138.

⁵³*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 97, column 2, l.23-9 & 31-4.

(§116)⁵⁴ Do-eirigh Roisderd iarla na Normaine oculus Tirri oculus adubrudur "Aisic sud, no do-ghentar boill ditt."

These demands of Richard and Tirri merely reiterate those which have already been made to the Admiral in §115⁵⁵. The Latin text is repeating these subjects to magnify their importance, although this repetition is not necessary for the storyline.

14.

(§117)⁵⁶ Hec eadem proloquitur Ogerus le Deneueis Admirando, Rolandus prorupit i haec verba. "Nobilis imperator Karolus tibi mandat ut dimittas ritum tue gentilitatis et convertas tu ad fidem Christianitatis, et celeriter sibi mittas reliquiis cum militibus. Vel faciat te suspendi cum ingenti confusione." Hoc idem proloquitur Gydo dux Burgundie.

(§117)⁵⁷ Oculus do-iarr Rolandus oculus Ogerus in cétna.

As for the previous example.

15.

(§120)⁵⁸ "Dic tu false proditor, quid nequitie vel prodicionis in me percepisti imponens in me maliciam aliarum mulierum? Nisi esset ob reverentiam domini mei, putridos dentes tuos infrigerem cum pugno."

(§120)⁵⁹ "Acht manifechainn d'onoir dom athair do-bhrisfinn th'fíacla drochdhatha dom dhorn."

⁵⁴Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.142.

⁵⁵*ibid.*

⁵⁶*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 97, column 2., l.39-46.

⁵⁷Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.142.

⁵⁸*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 98, column 1, l.32-5.

⁵⁹Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.144.

The omitted question from the start of the speech is of rather a rhetorical nature. The malice of women has already been mentioned in §119⁶⁰.

16.

(§122)⁶¹ Deinde illa dixit Rolando "Et tu quomodo vocaris?" "Domina vocor Rolandus filius Milonis de Anglie et filius sororis domini Karoli imperatoris."

(§122)⁶² Ocus do-fiarfaig do Rolandus mar sin, oculus do-innis dí,

An interesting piece of information, the association of Roland with England, has been omitted. Perhaps the Irish translator or scribes did not wish any magnifying of England by the association of this French knight with that kingdom.

17.

(§142)⁶³ Rolandus vero dixit ad Tirri de Arderneii "Custodias portam pagani ne intrantes praevalcant." Cui Tirri "Quid in me vidisti ficticie vel timiditatis? Quid ponar in loco tali et non prosequar inimicos Christi?" Cui Rolandus "Assumas tecum Ricardum ducem Normannie ad tuam securitatem et nostram. Si vero barbari praevenierint et praeoccupaverint portam,"

(§142)⁶⁴ Ocus adubairt Rolandus re Tirri ansa oculus iarla na Normaine a choimet doruis na cathrach, "oir da ticet na barburaigh cugainn oculus breith ar dorus na cathrach,"

⁶⁰ibid.

⁶¹*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 98, column 2, l.13-6.

⁶²Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.146.

⁶³*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 100, column 2, l.17-25.

⁶⁴Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.156.

The protests of Tirri have been ignored. The Irish translator did not feel that there was any need to include this perfunctory objection. It is not like the quarrel of Charles and Roland in §10 and §11⁶⁵ that helps form the foundation of the story.

Résumé

This section has demonstrated the close relationship between *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*. Further *Sdair Fortibrais* can easily be seen to be a close translation of the Latin text and not vice versa. The Irish translator has stayed faithful to his Latin text, omitting only what he felt to be an unnecessary repetition or piece of description. This closeness of the relationship between *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gesta Karoli Magni* is established most significantly first, by certain very close translations in the paragraphs presented, and second, by there being no evidence for a general divergence between the texts in the translation process. Features such as the use of the Latin names are a further indication of the nature of the relationship.

There are, of course, divergences between the texts, but they can be explained by the translator either misunderstanding the original Latin or consciously adapting and abridging the source text; there is no evidence that any other text was used as source for *Sdair Fortibrais*. The misunderstandings in the translation could be a result of either the translator's imperfect grasp of Latin, or of his mistakes made during periods of impatience or boredom. On the other hand, by adapting and abridging his source, the translator was able to simplify the source by the omission of unnecessary or repeated information, and give his own text further clarity. The overall effect was to give the translation a more 'streamlined' quality, flowing smoothly from scene to scene.

⁶⁵id., p.22.

The absence of any evidence to the contrary raises the presumption that the Irish text, which survives in its entirety, was originally translated from a complete copy of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. If this is so, material from the second half of *Sdair Fortibrais* may be used, cautiously, to represent the missing part of *Gesta Karoli Magni* when the characteristics of the complete Latin text are considered.

SECTION TWO**IDENTIFYING A CHANSON DE GESTE SOURCE****FOR *GESTA KAROLI MAGNI***

The next stage in the analysis of the Fierabras story is to determine, as far as possible, the nature of the source text from which the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni* worked. As has been seen¹, besides the *Chanson de Fierabras* itself, there are a number of extant adaptations and translations of the Fierabras story in French and English. In principle, none of these can be excluded from an examination aimed at establishing the place of *Gesta Karoli Magni* within the Fierabras tradition.

Given that the basic storylines are essentially the same in all extant versions of the Fierabras story, and given also that the Fierabras tradition shows plentiful evidence for literary creativity in minor details, the most effective approach to the question of provenance and filiations is, as often, to study the proper nouns that appear in the texts of the Fierabras story. A comparison of these names will demonstrate, in at least a preliminary way, the genetic relationships between *Gesta Karoli Magni* and other Fierabras texts.

A full comparative list of the names contained in *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* along with their equivalents from the French and English texts, including the work of William Caxton which post-dates the Irish tradition, is given in Appendix Two. This comparison demonstrates that almost every name that is contained in *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*² is to be found in a similar form in the French *Chanson de Fierabras*. The very small number of names found in the Latin and Irish texts that diverge from those found in the *Chanson de Fierabras* are unique to the

¹See above, Chapter Two, Section Two.

²Up till *Gesta Karoli Magni* breaks off, *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gesta Karoli Magni* are in effect identical. *Sdair Fortibrais* is hence assumed to give a good idea of what the missing part of *Gesta Karoli Magni* contained. In fact, there is only one name relevant to this section which is introduced in the second half of *Sdair Fortibrais*.

Irish tradition, and not found in any other version of the story; while, on the other hand, a good number of the names found in English and French texts of the Fierabras story go against the forms found in *Sdair Fortibrais*, *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the *Chanson de Fierabras*. In other words, it appears prime facie that none of these other texts could be the source of *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

The comparison also provides evidence for different traditions of the Fierabras story; for instance, what can be termed an Anglo-Norman tradition, which lacks a significant number of names contained in the Irish tradition, and an English tradition, of which the texts use certain distinctive spellings for names³. The Latin and Irish texts, on the other hand, are much more closely related to the French poetic tradition than to any other group of texts; it can be concluded that *Gesta Karoli Magni* is a descendant, if not a translation, of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. The examples from the full comparison listed below present a selection of the salient correspondences in name forms which make it clear that this is indeed the case.

Of minor personal names in the *Chanson de Fierabras* (i.e. those that tend to be lost in most French adaptations and English translations), twenty^{occur} in the Irish tradition (*Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*). Of these twenty, five occur nowhere else. The relationship indicated by these facts is one in which the Irish tradition depends more directly on the *Chanson de Fierabras* than do the other translations and adaptations of the Fierabras story. The forms taken by the names 'Fierabras' and 'Ogier li Danois' offer support to these conclusions.

Of the twenty minor names, some thirteen also occur in *Charles the Great* by Caxton, the English translation of Bagnyon's *Fierabras*. Although the texts of the Irish tradition and those of Bagnyon and Caxton are independent, both traditions show a

³The most notable example is the added -m- in the spelling 'Firumbras'; this spelling is also characteristic of the Anglo-Norman texts.

strong relationship with the *Chanson de Fierabras*. This is borne out by the additional fact that the *Chanson de Fierabras*, *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Charles the Great* all list the names of the most important swords of the Saracens and Christians. These swords were made by three brothers, whose names are listed along with the names of the swords they made. These names are given in this list form only in the aforementioned texts⁴.

The examples are laid out with the name printed after an abbreviation showing from which text the name is taken. The abbreviations used to represent all the versions of the Fierabras story are as follows:-

- F: French poem *Chanson de Fierabras*⁵;
- L: Latin prose *Gesta Karoli Magni*⁶;
- I: Irish prose *Sdair Fortibrais*⁷;
- AN: Anglo-Norman poem⁸;
- Fp: French prose adaptation⁹;
- DA: French prose of David Aubert¹⁰;
- FM: English poem *Sir Ferumbras*¹¹;
- FF: English poem 'Fillingham' *Firumbras* (partially extant)¹²;
- SD: English poem *Sowdon of Babylon*¹³;
- CG: English prose *Charles the Great* of William Caxton¹⁴.

⁴See Appendix 2 below. Certain other texts use some of the names of the swords, but they are not presented in this distinctive list form. As has been seen in the previous section, *Sdair Fortibrais* only has a short form of the list, listing the swords of only Fierabras himself.

⁵ed.A.Kræber & A.Servois in *Chanson de Fierabras. Parise la Duchesse*, Anciens Poètes de France vol.4, Paris, 1860, pp.1-204. Edition prepared with reference to four of the principal manuscripts of the *Chanson de Fierabras*.

⁶Edition of *Gesta Karoli Magni* in Part 2.

⁷ed.W.Stokes, *Revue Celtique* 19, 1898, pp. 14-57, 118-67, 252-91, 364-93.

⁸ed.L.Brandin, 'La Destruction de Rome et Fierabras' in *Romania* 64, 1938, pp.18-100.

⁹ed.J.Miquet, *Le Roman de Fierabras en Prose*, Montréal, 1984.

¹⁰ed.R.Guiette, *Chroniques et Conquestes de Charlemagne*, Brussels, 1940-52.

¹¹ed.S.J.Herrtage, *The Charlemagne Romances : 1. Sir Ferumbras*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 34, London, 1879.

¹²ed.M.I.O'Sullivan in *Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, Early English Text Society 198, London, 1935.

¹³ed.E.Hausknecht, *The Romance of the Sowdon of Babylon*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 38, London, 1881.

¹⁴ed.S.J.Herrtage, *The Lyf of the Noble and Chrysten Prince, Charles the Grete*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 36-37, London, 1880-1. This text is, of course, a slavish translation of Bagnyon's *Fierabras*. See Chapter Two, Section Two above.

Names Occurring only in the *Chanson de Fierabras* and the Irish Tradition¹⁵

These five names provide important evidence for a direct link between the *Chanson de Fierabras* and *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

F	Garsiliuns
L	Marsilion
I	-

F	Aymer
L	Haymerus
I	Hamerus

F	Galiene	Although the Latin version of this name is different from that of the French poem, the degree of differences is an acceptable one.
L	Galafer	
I	Calef	

F	Tempier	The initial G for T does not seem an impossible substitution in textual terms.
L	Geimper	
I	Giber	

F	Corcoil
L	Colconia
I	Coltonia

¹⁵'Irish Tradition' = *Gesta Karoli Magni* whether or not backed up by *Sdair Fortibrais*.

Names Occurring in the *Chanson de Fierabras*, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, and one or two other English or French texts

F	Ferrans (Espagne)	The name of the horse of Oliver.
L	Ferrant (Hyspania)	Note the appended placename in F and L.
I	-	
AN	-	
Fp	-	
DA	Ferrant	
FM	-	
FF	-	
SD	-	
CG	Ferraunt	
F	Milo (E/Aingler)	A rare name. Note the varying placename in
L	Milo (Anglia)	DA.
I	-	
AN	-	
Fp	-	
DA	Milon (Puille)	
FM	-	
FF	-	
SD	-	
CG	-	
F	Matusale	A rare name.
L	Matusale	
I	-	
AN	-	
Fp	-	
DA	-	
FM	-	
FF	-	
SD	-	
CG	Mathusale	

F	Floire
L	Gloir
I	-
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Floyre
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Florymonde

This rare name has been misspelt in the Latin translation.

F	Milon
L	Milon
I	-
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Myloun
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

A rare name.

F	Ysorés
L	Iacereth
I	Gasiredh
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Iosue

The Latin version of this name is rather different from that in the French poem.

F	Guillaume
L	William
I	Uilliam
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Gwylmyn
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Guyllam

Note the English form of L.

F	Clargis
L	Glaugis
I	Glacis
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Kargys
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Clorgys

Note CG's accurate reflection of F here.

F	Margaris
L	Marganus
I	Marganus
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Margaris

F	Amulgis
L	Amangis
I	Amaingis
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Maugis (Aigremort)
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Amancdys

The 'l' in F is isolated: a bad copy? The agreement of L, I and CG may suggest this.

F	Barbadas
L	Barbec(h)as
I	Barbec
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Barbarant (Maisonne)
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Barbacas

The name in the Latin and Irish texts most closely represents that of the French poem.

F	Claremonde
L	Claremunda
I	Claraminnda
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Clarymounde
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Clarmondye

A fairly regular name.

F	Flourete	Note the missing initial consonant of the Irish tradition.
L	Loreta	
I	Loreca	
AN	-	
Fp	-	
DA	-	
FM	Floraunce	
FF	-	
SD	-	
CG	Florette	

F	Margos	A deity name, not widely used.
L	Margoth	
I	Margoth	
AN	-	
Fp	-	
DA	-	
FM	-	
FF	Margot	
SD	-	
CG	Margot	

F	Mabon	A rare example of an infrequent name common to both the Irish and Anglo-Norman traditions.
I ¹⁶	Mabon	
AN	Mabon	
Fp	-	
DA	-	
FM	-	
FF	-	
SD	Mavon	
CG	Mahon	

¹⁶Note that *Gesta Karoli Magni* has broken off prior to this name being used.

Names in the List of Swords and their Makers occurring only in the *Chanson de Fierabras*, the Irish tradition, and *Charles the Great*

As mentioned above, the list of the Saracen and Christian swords and the names of the brothers who forged them form some of the best evidence for the *Chanson de Fierabras* being the source of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The only other text to have such a list, and hence such a link with the *Chanson de Fierabras*, is *Charles the Great*. Note that *Sdair Fortibrais* only lists the names of the swords of Fierabras at this time.

F	Joiousc
L	Joyus
I	-
CG	Ioyouse

F	Hauteclere
L	Hauteclere
I	-
CG	Haulteclere

F	Floberge	Note the muddling of the name in the Latin.
L	Fortbrige	
I	-	
CG	Floberge	

F	Durendal
L	Durindal
I	-
CG	Durandal

F	Musanguine	The Latin version is truncated, losing the first syllable. The version in CG is truncated in the same way, but contains further differences.
L	Sanguine	
I	-	
CG	Sauuogaye	

F	Courtain
L	Curtem
I	-
CG	Cortan

F	Galans	Here the version in L is freer.
L	Golians	
I	-	
CG	Galaus	

F	Munificas
L	Munificas
I	-
CG	Munyfycans

F	Aurisas	Both L and CG take liberties here: independently, it would seem.
L	Agrifax	
I	-	
CG	Aynisiar	

I	Ploranti
L	Plorans/te
F	Plourance
CG	Plourance

F	Bautisme
L	Bapteym
I	Bapten/Paten
CG	Baptysme

F	Garbain
L	Graban
I	Garban
CG	Grabam

Names found only in the Irish tradition

The second and third names are only used in the Irish Fierabras tradition to connect the Fierabras text to the prefatory *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*. The first and last cannot be so explained.

L	Gerarinus	It is unclear whether this name is from a source manuscript, or an invention.
I	-	

L	Helena
I	Elena

L	Constantinus
I	Constantinus

L	Lausag
I	Lausa

The Testimony of the Name of 'Fierabras'

The 'Fier-' element becomes 'Fort-' in the Irish tradition alone, possibly through the incorrect expansion of a manuscript form 'F-bras'? The Anglo-Norman and English texts alone insert a distinctive -m- into the name. The French texts, and Caxton following Bagnyon, alone preserve the 'original' form, as found in the *Chanson de Fierabras*.

F	Fierabras	This list shows how three very distinct 'national' groupings of texts have evolved.
L	Fortibras	
I	Fortibras	
AN	Fierembras	
Fp	Fierabras	
DA	Fier(r)abras	
FM	Fyrumbras	
FF	Firumbras	
SD	Ferumbras	
CG	Fyerabras	

The Testimony of the Name of 'Ogier the Dane'

While the Anglo-Norman, English and French texts treat 'Ogiers li Danois' of the *Chanson de Fierabras* pretty transparently, the Irish tradition shows more puzzling forms. *Gesta Karoli Magni* either had before him or created a modernised form of the Old French definite article 'li', but appears not to have recognised the adjectival 'danois' for what it was. *Sdair Fortibrais* seems to have not recognised 'le' as a definite article, and amalgamates it with the following word.

F	Ogiers li Danois
L	Ogerus le Deneuis
I	Ogerus Ledainnsedh
AN	Ogier li Daneis
Fp	Ogier (Danemarche)
DA	Ogier (Dannemarche)
FM	Oger the Deneys
FF	Oger Danys
SD	Oger Danoys
CG	Ogyer Danois (Denmarke)

Résumé

There can be little doubt that the creator of *Gesta Karoli Magni* had before him a text of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. None of the English and French derivatives of the *Chanson de Fierabras* preserves the names of characters and other proper names of the chanson de geste to anything like the extent that *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* do. However, it cannot be claimed that the author of *Gesta Karoli Magni* used a manuscript of the *Chanson de Fierabras* identical to the ones used by Kræber and Servois. The occasional variations in the names inexplicable by simple miscopying, and the couple of names not present in the extant texts of the French poem, may have been present in the source manuscript, though scribal vagaries could have played their own part here, as elsewhere. As expected, these variations are for the most part adopted in the Irish *Sdair Fortibrais*, which shows no signs of independent contact with the Fierabras tradition. The only tradition that shows some similarities to the Irish tradition is that which comprises the text of Caxton, and therefore its source by Bagnyon. However, these similarities need to be explained in terms of direct, though independent, contact with the chanson de geste.

**SECTION THREE *GESTA KAROLI MAGNI* - A TRANSLATION FROM
THE *CHANSON DE FIERABRAS***

Having established in the previous section the presumption that *Gesta Karoli Magni* is derived from a version of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, the practices and principles of the author of *Gesta Karoli Magni* should be examined more closely. At first sight, the relationship between *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the *Chanson de Fierabras* seems not nearly as close as that between *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gesta Karoli Magni*. For one thing, the Latin text is very considerably shorter than the French original. However, on closer inspection it becomes evident that the Latin translator's treatment of the *Chanson de Fierabras* is a combination of fairly close translation and abridgement according to discernible principles, the result being a somewhat 'condensed' translation.

The *Chanson de Fierabras* consists of 151 laisses of varying length¹. For the purposes of comparison it is sufficient to scrutinise representative sections of the text, in conjunction with the corresponding sections in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. As in the comparison of *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gesta Karoli Magni*, the paragraphs found in Stokes's edition of *Sdair Fortibrais* are used as the basis for scrutiny. *Sdair Fortibrais* itself is used for comparison after the point in the narrative where *Gesta Karoli Magni* ends.

¹ed.A.Kræber & A.Servois in *Chanson de Fierabras. Parise la Duchesse*, Anciens Poètes de France vol.4, Paris, 1860, pp.1-204. The base manuscript used in this edition is the fourteenth-century B.N., fr. 12603 written by a Picard scribe. Also used were Vatican, Regina Christia 1616 (dated 1317 from St. Brieuc), B.L. Royal 15 E VI (the wedding present for Henry VI) and B.N., fr. 1499 (fifteenth century Burgundian). Errata listed by M.Le Person, 'Liste des Vers Sautés, Ajoutés ou Déformés dans l'Édition par A.Kræber & G. Servois' in *Anonyme* 1987, pp.1215-28. Note also the later edition, started by A.Hilka before WWII, and finished by A. de Mandach, *Chanson de Fierabras. MS. IV. 578 de Hanovre*, Neuchâtel, 1981, which uses this thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman manuscript as base.

The complete *Sdair Fortibrais* contains 258 paragraphs², nine of which are used as the basis for the following examination: the first paragraph, the penultimate paragraph and seven further paragraphs, taken at regular intervals from the body of the text³. The Latin (or Irish where necessary) paragraphs will be listed, preceded by the equivalent lines from the *Chanson de Fierabras*. It has proved necessary in certain places to extend the comparison from just one paragraph of the Irish textual tradition. The primary reason for this is that the information contained in one paragraph of the Latin and Irish texts is not always presented in quite the same order in the *Chanson de Fierabras*, rendering a wider study necessary. It has also proved expedient to extend the comparison between the first paragraph of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the opening passage of the chanson de geste, as by themselves the first passages bear little relation to each other. This particular extension reveals a number of interesting features of the translator's technique.

To anticipate, it would appear that the creator of *Gesta Karoli Magni* followed the narrative of the *Fierabras* story carefully. However, his aim was to construct a narrative in which he could emphasise the important 'historical' facts of the story. Many apocryphal details, together with stereotyped poetic descriptions and other formal features proper to the chansons de geste, were hence omitted from the translation. As a result, while nothing in the basic narrative was lost, the length of the text was considerably reduced. In the following passages comment is directed towards elucidating selective and interpretative aspects of the translator's activity.

²ed.W.Stokes, *Revue Celtique* 19, 1898, pp.14-57, 118-67, 252-91, 364-93.

³Nine paragraphs plus the final sentence represent slightly more than 1/30 of the text.

1.

[L1]⁴

Seignour, or faites pais, s'il vous plaist, escoutez,
 Canchon fiere et orible, jamais meilleur n'orrez,
 Ce n'est mie menchoigne, mais fine verités.
 A Saint Denis en France fu li raules trouvés;
 Plus de cent cinquante ans a yl esté celez.
 Or en orés le voir, s'entendre me volés,
 Si com Karles de Fraunche, ki tant fu redoutés,
 Reconquist la coronne dont Dix fu couronnés,
 Et les saintismes claus, et le signe honneré,
 Et les autres reliques dont il i ot assés.
 A Saint Denis en France fu li tresors portés;
 Au perron, au lendi, fu partis et donnés.
 Pour les saintes reliques dont vous après orés,
 Pour chou est il encore li lendis apelés.
 Ja n'i doit estre treus ne nus tresors donnés;
 Mais puis par convoitisse fu cis bans trespasés;
 Moult par est puis li siecles empiriés et mués:
 Se li peres est maus, li fix vaut pis assés,
 Et du tout en tout est li siecles redoutés,
 Ke il n'i a un seul, tant soit espoentés,
 Ki tiegne vraiment ne foi ne loiautés.
 N'en dirai ore plus, s'arai avant alé.

[§1]⁵ Sicut apud Sanctum Dyonisium inter cetera gesta in scriptis reperitu. Post obdormitionem in domino bone memorie venerabilis Helene matris Constantini imperatoris quae crucem domini nostri Ihesu Christi cum corona ceterisque reliquiis sanctorum tanquam pia sancte ecclesiae filiae Ierosolimis deportavit a Iudeis cruce divisa per partes et ad diversa loca <.....> per piam devotionem beate ecclesie oblatas, tandem corona cum clavis ceterisque reliquiis pontifici Romano Rome erant oblate.

The opening sections of the two texts reflect the differing purposes of their authors and are not directly comparable at the verbal level. The opening of the *Chanson de*

⁴Kræber & Servois, *op.cit.*, p.1-2, l.1-22.

⁵*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 85, column 1, l.1-10.

Fierabras explains what is going to happen and indicates the principal subjects of the story: Charlemagne is going to retrieve the Crown of Thorns and bring it to St. Denis. This passage also serves as the author's personal prologue to his *chanson de geste*. *Gesta Karoli Magni* strikes a more historical note with its back-references to the discovery of the True Cross by Helena and the capture of the Crown of Thorns by the infidels. The point of contact between the *Chanson de Fierabras* and *Gesta Karoli Magni* is the statement that the story was found at St. Denis (at which point, the *chanson de geste* notes the antiquity of the story by stating that it lay unread for many years); beyond that, they diverge: the *Chanson de Fierabras* is constrained by the conventions of the *chansons de geste*, *Gesta Karoli Magni* by the need to manufacture continuity with *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, the text which acts as preface to the *Fierabras* story in the Irish tradition⁶.

This comparison of the opening sections of the two texts does not prove to be very satisfactory when considering the method of translation. The example needs to be extended in order to illuminate how the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni* handled the material which is actually included at the start of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. The extension required is unusually long, as the information contained in the *chanson de geste* has been reordered in translation.

(L1)⁷

Karles ot ses barons semons et demandés
 De par toute sa tere où est sa poestés;
 Moult fu grans li barnages quant il fu assanlés.
 Tant les a l'enpereres et conduis et menés,
 K'es aus sur Morimonde a fait tendre ses trés.
 Oliveiers li jentieus, ki tant fu alosés,
 Icil fist l'avangarde à .v^c. fers armés;
 Le val Raier garda tout contreval les prés.
 Et païen lor salirent à l'issue des gués;

⁶See Chapter 2, Section 2.

⁷Krøber & Servois, *op.cit.*, pp.2-4, l.23-92.

.L. mile furent, les gonfanons fremés,
 Pour calanger les teres et les grans yretés.
 Oliviers li gentieus i fu le jour navrés.
 Desconfit fuissent Franc, c'est fine verités,
 Quant les secourut Karles o les viellars barbés,
 Et paien s'en tournerent les frains abandonés.
 Karles s'en retourna as loges et as trés;
 Cele nuit fu Rollans laidis et mal menés.
 L'endemain par matin, quant solaus fu levés,
 Li a canté la messe li capelains fourrés.
 Après fu li mengers gentement aprestés;
 Mais ains qu'il pregnent l'yaue, sera griés et irés;
 Car uns Sarrasins est en l'angarde montés:
 Onques plus fiers paiens ne fu de mere nés.

[L2]

Moult fu grans li barnages quant li rois dut laver;
 Mais ains qu'il preignent l'yaue n'y ara que yrer,
 Car uns Sarrasins vint en l'angarde monter:
 Jamais de plus fier homme n'ora nus hon parler;
 Et fu roy d'Alixandre, si l'avoit à garder,
 Siue estoit Babylone dusc'à la rouge mer,
 Et si avoit Coloigne, Roussie à gouverner,
 Et des tors de Palerne se fait sire clamer.
 Et si voloît par force en Romme sejourner,
 Et tous cheus de la vile à servage tourner.
 Mais chil par dedens Romme nel vaurent créanter;
 Pour tant les fist destruire et Saint Piere gaster.
 Mort y a l'apostole et fait en duel finer,
 Et moines et nonnains y a fait violer;
 S'enporta la couronne qui moult fait à loer,
 Et le signe et les claus dont on fist Diu clauer,
 Et les dignes reliques que je ne sai nommer;
 Si tint Jerusalem, qui tant fait à amer,
 Et le digne sepucre où Diex vaut susciter.
 Le on du Sarrazin vous sai ge bien nommer:
 Fierabras d'Alixandre se fasoit apeler.

[L3]

Moult fu li Sarrains fiers et mautalentis,
 Moult grand effroi demaine sur le mul arabi.
 A .II. lieues entour a cerkié le pais;
 Pour Franchois enconrer s'estoit à bandon mis;
 Quant n'en puet nul trouver, s'en fu grains et maris.
 Li Sarazins s'areste sous .II. arbres flouris,
 Et voit le tref Karlon desous li pin antis,
 Et l'aigle d'or qui vente quant solous esclarchist;
 De loges et de trés voit tous les prés vestis.
 Quant li paiens le voit, moult s'en est engramis;
 Mahomet e jura et ses saintes merchis
 Jamais ne fuiera ses ara estourmis.
 À hautes vois s'escrie "Ahi! Rois de Paris,
 Envoie à moi jouter, mauvais couars falis,
 De tes barons de France cels qui plus sont de pris,
 Rollant et Olivier, et si viegne Tierris,
 Et Ogiers li Danois, qui tant par est hardis;
 Ja n'en refuserai, par Mahom, jusqu'à .VI.
 Et se nes envoiés ansi con j'ai requis,
 Ains le vespre seras à ton tref assalis.
 Ja ne m'en tournerai si seras desconfis,
 Puis te taurai la teste au branc qui est forbis,
 Rollant et Olivier enmerrai je chaitis;
 Mar passastes chà outre, mauvais couars poris."
 À iceste parole est sur l'arbre guenchis;
 Des armes ke il porte s'est moult tost desvestis.

[§2]⁸ Regnante vero Karolo nobili imperatore in Francia pro rege venit unus Admirandus qui super omnes paganos principatum optinuit. Habens filium nomine Fortibras cui in decore nec valore vix aliquis valuit assimilari. Erat enim probitatis in multis deligantis <.....>. Longitudo vero ipsius erat quindecem pedum. Erat utique tante probitatis quod in omni loco bellandi, triumphavit. Et adhuc habuit unam sororem legitimam nomine Floripes mulieres totius regni decore praezellens. Alludo seu candor nivis carnem eius non praefulsit. Admirandus autem furians nitebatur totum Christianorum destruere una cum filio Fortibras non cessans erectos prosternere et sanctos per diversa loca martyrisare. Tandem Roman veniens, papam nomine

⁸*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 85, column 1, l.10-49; column 2, l.1-20.

Iohannem occidit. Monachos seu quoscumque sanctos gladiavit. Civitate itaque devicta coronam Ihesu cum uteris reliquiis usque at turrim de Egrimor secum iussit deportari. [§3] Karolus autem imperator volens de manibus barbarorum reliquias eripere congregavit exercitum suum cum suis xii. paribus et viriliter progrediens et regnum Francie pertransiens fixit tentoria sua distantia per xii dietas ab Erimor. [§4] Fortibras vero ex audito intellegens regem Karolum venturum congregavit sibi quinquaginta milia armatorum et disposuit ut quadraginta milia committerent bellum contra Christianos et quod decem milia laterent inter fruticas donec bannum suum audirent volens furtive facere irruptionem contra Karolum. Tamen confidens in virtute suae fortitudinis venit armatus ad trabem Karoli quae pro ligno fuit fixa. Ad exercitum gestavit clipeum in collo et hastam in manu. Sedens autem super dextrarium suum vociferate sic clamavit "Tu rex Karoli cum florida barba, veni et ostende virtutem tuam in dimicando mecum si audes. Si timor te invasit mitte Rolandum vel Oliverum vel quemcumque nobilem. Et si timeat solum cum solo proeliari veniant duo. Et si quattuor vel quinque contra me veniunt ad proeliandum eos non timebo. Et si non feceris, veniam cum valida multitudine et te premam nobiles vero milites tuos interficiam et regnum tuum ex toto destruiam." [§5] Interim autem, pagani graviter irruerunt in Christianos committentes dirum bellum. Et nisi Karolus supervenisset in auxilium, Rolandus cum xii paribus fuissent devicti et barbari potiti victorias. In quo conflictu Oliverus graviter est plagatus, multis paganis interfectis. [§6] Hiis peractis remeavit ad sua tentoria cum exercitu. Dominus Karolus iubet mensas apponi ad cibandum. Et cum mero cepit exilarari prorupit in verba iactantie "Milites senes plus valuerunt in proelio quam iuniores". Unde Rolandus multum indignatus una cum ceteris militibus iunioribus.

In the first instance, it can be seen how all the basic information contained in the *chanson de geste* is also contained in some fashion in the Latin translation: nevertheless, the order of presentation is different. The *Chanson de Fierabras* starts with Charles's march to the area called Morimonde⁹, the ambush of the vanguard by the Saracens, the wounding of Oliver, the heroism of the old knights and the humiliation of Roland. The poem then proceeds to introduce Fierabras, the most outstanding 'king' in the Saracen army, the destroyer of Rome, and stealer of the Relics of the Passion: after his introduction, Fierabras makes his challenge to Charles

⁹Note: this name is not represented in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, an example of an omitted detail.

and the peers. This order of events does not suggest that the French army had travelled specifically to rescue the Relics of the Passion (although the introductory passage leaves the reader in no doubt as to the principal subject of the story).

Conversely, in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, it is the theft of the Relics of the Passion that triggers the march of the French army. By the time the march commences, the text has already introduced Fortibras, a principal culprit behind the destruction of Rome and the removal of the Relics to Egrimor (not mentioned in the *Chanson de Fierabras*). The opportunity is also taken to introduce the other members of the Saracen royal family, Fortibras's father and brother, who both play major roles in the plot. A result of the earlier introduction of Fortibras is the reordering of the military events. Fortibras's challenge to Charles and the peers comes before the ambush of the French, the wounding of Oliver, the heroism of the old knights and the humiliation of Roland. Regarding this humiliation, the translator describes the bragging of Charles which causes so much offence: the reason for the humiliation is not made clear in the *chanson de geste* until later. The overall effect of the reordering of the events gives the narrative of *Gesta Karoli Magni* a greater sense of historiography: there is a clear object to the mission of Charles, the important characters and events being described as early as possible.

The two texts also differ with respect to which minor pieces of information they include. For example, the *Chanson de Fierabras* is careful to present the rather 'rhythmical' list of places which are subject to Fierabras, considered unnecessary (or unlikely?) by the Latin translator. On the other hand, *Gesta Karoli Magni* includes the name of the pope murdered by Fortibras, an important piece of historical information. The Latin translation also notes the configuration of the Saracen army for the first battle. Concerning other details, the *chanson de geste* includes phrases which are less informative, but have more of a poetic-descriptive force: for example, the mention of

the golden eagle outside Charles's tent which reflects the sun. Likewise, in the challenge, the *Chanson de Fierabras* mentions four of the peers, and describes what will happen to Charles on defeat; *Gesta Karoli Magni* is rather curter, mentioning only two peers, and presenting the potential result in a less vivid fashion. The details continue to show how one text is an epic poem, the other a history.

Although these points of comparison all reflect differences between the two traditions, it must nevertheless be remembered that the paragraphs of *Gesta Karoli Magni* still seem to have been relatively closely translated from the *Chanson de Fierabras*. As well as the preservation of all the basic information in translation, certain phrases have been translated quite closely: note, for example, the pluperfect subjunctive in "Desconfit fuissent Franc, c'est fine verités, quant les secourut Karles o les viellars barbés," and its retention in "Et nisi Karolus supervenisset in auxilium, Rolandus cum xii paribus fuissent devicti". Also note the close parallel between the description of Fierabras's destruction of Rome in both texts (i.e. "Et si voloit par force en Romme sejourner que je ne sai nommer." and "Tandem Roman veniens iussit deportari."), and the use of the same formula to present the challenge of Fierabras, a formula comprising the initial exclamation supported by an insult, the challenge to a number of the French knights, and the final threat. Although the translation is not direct, the dependency of the translator on his original is quite apparent.

2.

(L14)¹⁰

Et respont Oliviers "De folie parlés;
Ou vous veulliés ou non, le destrier me lairés,
Et si perdrés la test se vis ne vous rendés."
Quant l'entent Fierabras, à poi n'est forsenés.

¹⁰Kræber & Servois, *op.cit.*, pp.15-6, 1.471-504.

[L15]

"Garin", dist Fierabras, "lai moi à toi parler:
 Hardis es de combatre, moult fais bien à amer;
 Par Mahomet, mon diu, je n'i voi que blasmer;
 Mais à nul si bas homme ne veu je pas jouter,
 Car se je t'ocioie, moult m'en devroit peser.
 Jamais n'aroie honnour, je ne t'en quier celer,
 S'au fil de vavasour ere venus capler.
 Mais je te vaurai ja moult grant honneur moustre:
 Desuer ce bauçant sor me verras ja monter,
 Et tu l'eslaisse à force quanque pues randonner;
 Je me lairai caioir et de mon gré verser;
 Bien en pues mon ceval et mon iscu porter.
 Puis m'envoie Rollant ou Olivier son per,
 U Ogier li Danois, qui tant fait à loer.
 Et se li uns n'i ose ne venir ni aler,
 Il i en viegne doi pour leur cors esprover,
 U li tiers ou li quars; ja n'ierent refusé."
 "Certes" dist Oliviers, "de folie parlés."
 Et li vilains le dist piecha ou reprouver
 Que tés se cuide bien ensignier et garder
 Que de son droit méismes se doit bien encombrer.
 Il est lius de taisir et s'est lius de parler,
 Et de l'un et de l'autre puet on fol resanbler.
 "Paiens" dist Oliviers, "trop t'ai oï vanter;
 Je ne suis mie lievres ci pour espoenter.
 Ains ke voies le vespre, le soleil esconser,
 Te quit faire la teste des espauls sevrer.
 Va, biaux amis, si t'arme, trop me fais demorer,
 Et se ce non, par Diu qui se laissa pener,
 Je te ferai cest fregne parmi le cors passer."

[§33]¹¹ Cui Oliverus "velis nolis, equum ducam cum capite tuo." Cui Fortibras "Nichil vituperabile in te video nisi pugnillans cum tam exili persona, ne imputaretur pro obprobrio. Rogo pro militia tua quod facias votum meum vel quaeras Rolandum vel Oliverum vel Ogerum vel aliquem nobilem ne nobilitas mea vilificetur. Vel veniant

¹¹*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 87, column 2, l.48-9; Page 88, column 1, l.1-11.

contra me duo vel tres de validioribus, quia honorificum est certare cum talibus." Cui Oliverus "Ante solis occasum arrogantiam tue iactantie humiliabo. Adhuc dico te praepares antequam te perforem."

These extracts, when compared, show a certain 'economy' of the Latin translation. Take, for example, the first speech of Oliver: although certain phrases are translated literally, the sentiment can be expressed in fewer words in Latin; 'Et respont Oliviers' becomes 'Cui Oliverus', and "'Ou vous veuilliés ou non'" becomes "'Velis Nolis'"¹². In addition, certain phrases are omitted or condensed in translation: the phrase "'De foli parlés'" is omitted, and "'Et si perdrés la test se vis ne vous rendés'" is added to the previous phrase to become "'cum capite tuo'". These two phrases are an essential part of the structure of the *laisse* in the French text; however their use from this stylistic point of view becomes redundant in scholastic Latin prose.

Generally throughout this French extract, there are considerably more passages of description which the Latin translator did not feel inclined to translate literally. Note for example the first two and a half lines of the speech of Fierabras, which are not translated. The following one and a half lines are translated almost literally: "'je n'i voi que blasmer, mais à nul si bas home ne veu je pas jouter,'" becomes "'Nichil vituperabile in te video nisi pugnillans cum tam exili persona'". However, the rhetoric of Fierabras concerning honour is highly condensed into one phrase in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, "'ne imputaretur pro obprobrio'". In partial recompense, the translator has extended the request of Fierabras from just "'Puis m'envoie'" to "'Rogo pro militia tua quod facias votum meum vel quaeras'".

The final section of the French text has been considerably reduced in translation. The first sentence of Oliver's reply and the following descriptive passage have been eliminated in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The remainder of the reply is present, but in a

¹²Note: both these classical clichés are found regularly in *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

highly condensed form. For example, "Ains ke voies le vespre, le soleil esconser," becomes merely "Ante solis arrogantium". The extra poetic verbosity of the *Chanson de Fierabras* was not required in its Latin translation which purported to be a work of history.

3.

(L39)¹³

Oliviers se resgarde aval parmi les prés,
Voit venir Sarrazins les frains abandonnés.
Deveant trestous les autres, Brulans de Monmoirés
Sist sor 1 dromadaire ki ains ne fu lassés,
Qui plus tost porprent terre que lievres descouplés.
Les caillaus fiert au pié, li fus en est volés;
Fiers fu li Sarrazins ki sour lui fu armés;
En sa main 1 fausart, dont li fers fu quarrés,
Du sanc du boterele estoit envenimés.
 Quant Oliviers le voit li sans li est mués,
 Et dist à Fierabras "Frere, car descendés;
 Ne vous os plus conduire, tant sui je plus irés.
 Ja serai de bataille durement apressés,
 Car de Sarrazins voi tous ces tertres rasés;
 Sacez, se li m'ataignent, mors sui et afolés."
 Quant l'entent Fierabras, moult en fu asbosmés,
 Et dist à Olivier "Sire, si me lairés?
 C'est grand recreandise, puisque conquis m'avés.
 Las! se je muir paiens, chaitis, que devenrés?
 Sainte Marie dame, et car me secourés!"

[L40]

Dist li rois Fierabras "Sire quens Olivier,
 Pour l'amour Dieu te pri que ci ne melaiser.
 Ber, ja m'as tu conquis au branc de ton acier,
 Et si m'as tu juré, plevi et fiancié
 Que pour Diu me feras lever et bautisier;
 Se ensi me guerpis peu te doit on prisier.

¹³Kræber & Servois, *op.cit.*, pp.48-50, l.1565-631.

Puisqu'en canp m'as conquis, bien me dois calengier.
 Encore ne te vi je ne navrer ne plaié,
 Ne à ton branc d'acier sor paien caploier."
 Et respont Oliviers "Dit as qe chevalier;
 Damedie me confunde, ki tout à bailler,
 Se jamais te guerpis s'aurai grant encombrier."
 "Sire", dist Fierabras, "pour Diu te voel proier,
 Reverse moi du dos ce blanc haberc doblie,
 Si le vest sor le tien; anqui t'ara mestier,
 Car n'as à ton col targe ni escu de quartier."
 "Volentiers", dist li quens bien fait à otrier."
 La ventaille deslace, si l'a fait fors glacier,
 Et li quens le vesti, qui Diex gart d'encombrier.
 Puis a mis sor son elme son boin capel s'acier,
 Et a trait Hauteclere, dont bien se set aidier.
 Or puet venir qui veut joster à Olivier:
 Ainsi porroit huer à la tour d'un mostier;
 moult sera bien ferir qu'il fera tresbucier.

[L41]

Oliviers tient le roi devant lui traversé;
Volentiers l'en portast, mais trop a demoré.
Car Sarrazin li vienent, qui li ont devéé.
Atant es vous poignant Brulant de Monmiré;
Le dromadaire broce pour le plus tost aler.
Fiert le conte Olivier sor le haume safré;
Li autres aubers desous a le conte sauvé.
Li fausars vole en pieces, moult a petit duré.
 Quant le voit Fierabras, tout a le sanc mué;
 Olivier apela, congié li a donné:
 "Oliviers, met moi jus, assés as enduré;
 Ne t'en doi pas blasmer ne savoir mavaï gré.
 Pour amour Dieu me gete de cest cemin fieré,
 Que mon cors ne defoulent ci ceval sejourné.
 damedix te sekeure par sa sainte bonté,
 Et il ait hui de moi et manaide et pité!
 Moult m'esmerveil de Karle, le fort roi couronné,
 Quant il ne te sekeurt; trop ara demouré.
 Que fait Rollans, qui tant vous a amé,

Que il ne te sekeurt à trestout so barné?
 Caitis, or i mourai, n'arai crestienté!"
 Quant Oliviers l'entent, moult en a grant pité.

(§63)¹⁴ "..... Quod lucrum vel gloria tibi erit interficere me iam mortificatum? Parce obsecro mihi et rogo ut pro tua nobili militia colloques me super equum coram te et educas me ad imperatorem qui faciat me curari si fieri potest." Et dixit "Olivere rogo ut induaris istam loricam, nam quinquaginta milia barbarorum misi in bosco delitere qui si a casu occurrerint, valebis securius eis resistere." [§64] Oliverus itaque hoc audiens motus pietate lacrimatur. Fortibras autem adiecit "Insuper omnia sumas tecum gladios meos, ut reor equidem non sunt meliores ipsis. Oliverus posuit eum ex transverso equum ante ipsum, quia sedere nequivit. [§65] Subito vero ex latibulo exiit impetuose Brulandus de Momira. Barbarus autem percussit Oliverum in pectore et nisi secunda fuisset lorica letale vulnus sibi impressisset.

It has proved necessary to extend this particular comparison from the single paragraph 65 of the Latin text, because the material in this paragraph is represented in two quite distinct places in the *Chanson de Fierabras*; these lines have been underlined in the above French extract. The text between these two passages represents a portion of paragraph 63, and paragraph 64 of *Gesta Karoli Magni*: indeed, the first half of the Bruland episode cuts right through the speech of Fierabras which is all contained within paragraph 63 of the Irish text. Material from paragraphs 63 and 64 is also found after the end of the Bruland episode.

The material from the French poem concerning Bruland has been dramatically shortened in translation: the description about this Saracen is omitted, and only the barest details are preserved in the translation, that is his name, and the reference to the effect of the second hauberk. This passage also shows how the order of the original could be altered in the translation. The Latin translator has given the references to Bruland only minor importance when compared with his representation in the *chanson de geste*. The translator was not interested in the literary effect of his

¹⁴*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 91, column 1, l.27-45.

original, being concerned only with the factual content; hence, he could combine two non-adjacent passages from the original in his translation.

Regarding the remainder of the extracts, what is manifest is a considerable reduction in the length of the narrative. The truncation of the laments of Fierabras is particularly noticeable: indeed, the first speech of Fierabras contained in paragraph 63 of *Gesta Karoli Magni*, in which he admits defeat, expresses his desire to become a Christian, pleads for his life, and suggests that Oliver take his three swords¹⁵, originally starts well before the first mention of Bruland. Although the Latin text contains this information, it is in a very shortened manner. Note, for example, the last speech of Fierabras, which is barely represented in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. Nevertheless, the final sentence, 'Quant Oliviers l'entent, moult en a grant pitié' is translated literally by 'Oliverus itaque hoc audiens motus pietate lacrimatur' and placed at the end of the major speech in which Fierabras warns Oliver about the cunning Saracen stratagem.

4.

(L56)¹⁶ "Signeur", dist Floripas, "or vous ai ge jeté
De la cartre parfonde où tant a cruauté,
Et si estes çaiens en ma cambre enserré.
S'aucuns nous a oï, mal sommes ostelé;
Si ai je moult grant tort, ce saciés de verté.
Oliviers que ci est a mon frere navré;
Bien vous connois trestous, ne puet estre celé.
Mais ja n'i arés garde, soiés aséuré,
Et voel que vo convent soient tuit demonstré.
"Dame", dist Oliviers, "à vostre volenté."
"Volentiers", dist la bele, "quant vous l'avés juré."
Ele tendi le main, et il ont affié

¹⁵Although this particular passage is given in the above extract, the appropriate lines of the *Chanson de Fierabras* have not been included for reasons of space: it is paragraph 65 of the Latin text which is the principal concern.

¹⁶Krøber & Servois, p.68-9, l.2223-46.

Que selonc leur pooir feront sa volenté.
 "Signeur", dist Floripas, "or dirai mon pensé.
 1 chevalier de France ai lontans enamé:
 Guis a nom de Borgoigne, moult i a bel armé;
 Parens est Karlemaine et Rollant l'aduré.
 Dès que je fui à Romme, m'a tout mon cuer emblé;
 Quant l'amirans mes peres fist gaster la cité,
 Lucafer de Baudas abati ens ou pré,
 Et lui et le ceval, d'un fort espiel quarré.
 Se cis n'est mes maris, je n'arai homme né;
 Pour lui voel je croire ou roi de sainte maïsté."
Quant François l'ont oï, Jhesu en ont loé.

[§96]¹⁷ Postquam hauserant potum electum, dixit Floripes "Bene habeo notitiam vestram. Novi vero te esse Oliverum qui germanum meum superasti, et te Bernardum, et Gylmerum Scotum. Ego iam de gravi carcere liberavi vos. Nunc demonstravero vobis secreta mea, et rogo ut foveatis negotio meo. Quando vero Admirandus pater meus Romam destruxit, et reliquias diversas violenter adquisivit, ego prospexi et vidi unum militem de Francia nepotem Karoli, obviantem Lucufer de Blandas, et ipsum cum equo egregie prostravit. Unde huc usque prae ceteris mortalibus dilexi et ipsi soli observo corpus meum in virginitate, et ut sibi coniugar secla maritali. Tanquam fidei diligenter laboraveritis, ego ero vobis in omnibus auxiliatrix, et ob amore eius obligo me fieri Christiana." [§97] Quod audientes barones gavisii sunt gaudio magno. Oliverus grato vultu respondit "Domina in nullo oportet vobis timere quin te parebimus usque ad mortem pro voluntate vestra complenda, cum tempus sit et locus."

In this case the natural starting-point and finishing-point of the episode cut across the paragraph divisions of the Latin translation. Paragraph 97 of the Latin text is represented by only two, non-consecutive lines in the French poem¹⁸. However, to give the impression that the Latin translator had added to the original story would be misleading. In the previous paragraph of *Gesta Karoli Magni*, it can be seen that the speech of Floripes is continuous. In the French poem, it is interrupted by a short,

¹⁷*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 95, column 1, l.13-35.

¹⁸These lines are underlined in the French extract.

interjected one-line response from Oliver, 'Dame,, à vostre volenté'. Although translated fairly literally by 'Domina pro voluntate vestra complenda', this response has been transposed to the end of Floripes's speech by the Latin translator, where it is augmented by Oliver's assurance of the fidelity of the knights to her desire. Between the speeches of Floripes and Oliver, the line 'Quant François l'ont oï, Jhesu en ont loé' is represented by the very similar 'Quod audientes barones gavisī sunt gaudio magno'.

It must be noted that the translator has retained all of the main details of the speech of Floripes. This speech is of great importance to the story; it tells the reader why Floripes is going to betray the Saracen faith in favour of Christianity. There are some almost literal translations: for example, 'Oliviers que ci est a mon frere navré' is translated by 'Oliverum qui germanum meum superasti', and 'Quant l'amirans mes peres fist gaster' becomes 'Quando vero Admirandus pater meus Romam destruxit'. *Gesta Karoli Magni* also includes some additional information to ensure clarity in the narrative: the reader is reminded of some of the knights present, and also reminded that the Admiral snatched the Relics when he destroyed Rome; also, it is made clear that Floripes is to be an assistant to the Christians. An interesting omission is the name of the knight whom Floripes loves. Is this an attempt at literary suspense?

5.

(L68)¹⁹

Li paiens va le duc au grant foier mener;
 Quant Rollans l'a véu, Berart prinst à resner
 "Or porrés ja bel jeu véoir et esgarder;
 Dchait ait ne laira lui et Namlon juer."
 Lucifer s'abaissa pour l tison combrer,
 Trestout le plus ardant que il i puet trouver;
 De tel aïr soufla le fu en fist voler.

¹⁹Kræber & Servois, pp.88-9, l.2911-25.

Puis a dit à Namlon "Or repoés souffler."
 Namles prinst le tison, ki bien se sot garder,
 Si soufla le tison le fu en fist voler,
 La barbe et le grenon fist au païen bruler.
 Très enmi le visage li va de plain hurter,
 Que pour 1 seul petirt ne le fist souviner.

[§129]²⁰ Et inclinavit et accepit faxem ingentem, et eum tanto impetu sufflavit quod sintille sparse sunt per cameram totam. Et tradens faxem ad ducem dicit "Inveterate tuum est nunc sufflare." Dux vero insufflavit impetuose sic quod sintille combusserunt barbam et supercilia.

Here, the Latin includes most of the substance of the French, but omits some detail. The first four lines of the poem, in which the Duke is led to the fire and invited to watch, are not translated at all; the translator wanted to proceed quickly to the event described in the *chanson de geste*, without having to include any introductory formula. From this point, the next four lines, 'Lucifer s'abaissa pour "Or repoés souffler"' are translated almost literally, as indeed are the lines describing the action of the duke, from 'Si soufla le tison le païen bruler'. The actions of Lucifer and Namles were clearly considered to be important details of the narrative that needed inclusion in the translation. The translations are fairly literal as the French lines themselves contain little in the way of added poetic description: an exception is the line 'Namles prinst le tison, ki bien se sot garder', of which the last clause merely serves literary purposes. The same can be said of the last two lines of the French extract which add little in the way of substance to the narrative.

[At this point the Latin text breaks off, and so paragraphs taken from the Irish translation *Sdair Fortibrais* are supplied.]

²⁰*Gesta Karoli Magni*, Page 99, column 1, l.34-40.

(L83)²¹ "Brulans, dist l'amirans, "or avés trop parlé;
 Fuiés de devant moi, trop i avés esté."
 1 baston a saisi, si li éust rué,
 Quant li rois Sortinbrans li a des puins osté.

[L84] "Sire", dist Sortinbrans, "laissiés vostre tenchon,
 "Faites sonner vos cors, cele tor assalonz;
 N'i dueront François, li encriemé felon."
 Et respont l'amirans "Je l'otroi, par Mahom."

[§161]²² Ocus do-ghab fearg mór Admirandus annsin, 7 mana beth Sortibrandus do-bhuailfedh co hesanorach é, 7 adubairt Sortibrandus "Dena, a thigerna, mar adubartsa rit."

Although this comparison is short, certain features of the translation process continue to be exposed. From *laisse* 83, the Irish text has replaced the direct speech of the Admiral by a short phrase describing his emotion: the reader is informed of his actions and not of his words. The French text also describes how Sortibrand restrained the Admiral, information which has to be inferred from the Irish text. Also, although the direct speech of Sortibrand from *laisse* 84 is preserved in translation, it is present in an abridged fashion. In the French poem Sortibrand tells the Admiral what to do, and the Admiral replies; in the Irish text, Sortibrand merely says 'Dena, a thigerna, mar adubartsa rit'. By the summarising of certain phrases in the translation, eight lines of French verse have become little more than two of Irish prose.

²¹Kræber & Servos, *op.cit.*, p.113, l.3724-31.

²²Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.252.

7.

(L107)²³

A iceste parole ont les soummiers trousés,
 Par le pont de Mautrible les vont chaçant serrez
 Or les conduie Dix, li rois de maïstes!
 Mais ains que il soit vespres ne solaus esconsés,
 N'i vorroit li miudres estre pour 1000 mars d'or pesé.
 Agolafres les voit venir tous abrievés.
 Par devant le postel est li glous arestés,
 Sor son col une hace, dont li mans est bendés;
 La lemele est d'acier, 4 piés a de lé,
 Plus trence que rasoirs, quant il est afilés.
 Li paiens estoit grans, hideusement formés:
 El haterel deriere avoit les ex tornés,
 Plaine paume ot de langue et demi pié de nés,
 Oreilles ot velues et les grenons mellés,
 Et devant et deriere estoit ensi formés.
 Si avoit 2 oreilles, onques ne furent tels,
 Cascune tenoit bien demi sestier de blé;
 Sor sa teste les torne quant les souprent orez.
 Les bras avoit moult lons et les piés fokelez.
 Onques si laide forme d'omme ne fu formés;
 Moult bien sanble diables nouvel encaïnés.
 Li amirans Balans le tient en grant fiertés;
 Conestable estoit de trestout son regné;
 Ses passages li ot l'amirans commandé.
 Or penst Dix de nos gens, qui en crois fu penés;
 Que, se nus en puet estre percéus n'avisés,
 Ne les garroit tous l'ors qui onques fu trouvés
 Que cascuns n'ait la teste et les membres copés.

[L108]

François passent Mautrible le pont à grant friçon.
 Richars ala devant, ou chief le caperon;
 Li soumier sont arriere et tout li compaignon,
 Entresi à la porte n'i font arestisson.
 Agolafres les voit, les a mis à raison;

²³Krøber & Servois, *op.cit.*, pp.143-4, 1.4735-79.

Il demande à Richart "D'ont vient la garison?
 D'ont es tu, de quel tere et qui sont cil baron?"
 Richars torna sa langue, si parla Aragon:
 "Sire, marcéans sui, si vig de garison;
 De draperie avon grant plenté et foison.
 Que il i doit avoir grant feste de Mahon.
 S'à Aigremore estiemes, 2 jours sejournerons;
 A l'amirant Balan nostre avoir monsterron,
 Et lui et son barnage, se il velt, en donron.
 Cil autre marcéant sont trestout Esclavon;
 Ensigniés nous, biaux sire, où nous aquiteron."

[§193]²⁴ Ocus do-chuaidh Roisderd rompu docum in droichit, 7 do-chuaidh mara roibhe in t-aithech .i. Galafer, 7 do-bhí tuagh adhuathmur 'na laim, 7 dob ingnadh a mhed, oir do-bhí traígh 'na bhél, 7 do-anfadh buisel cruithnechta in gach cluais dó, 7 colpadha fada croma fáil acht ata ní cena dobo chosmaile re Diabul é na re duine, 7 dob e sin consdabla gach uile flaithefnais do-bhí ag Amirandus, 7 adubairt se re Roisderd "Ce tú, a oclaich, 7 ca hinadh asa tangais?" 7 do-chlaechlodh Roisderd tenga dó 7 adubairt ris "Cendaigedha sinne aga fuilit eididi uaisle fa comuir Amiranduis 7 a bharun uasal."

The striking feature of the comparison between laisse 107 and paragraph 193 is the abridging of a long, descriptive passage by the translator. Although ^{the} Irish text describes the giant in the same general way, the description is much shorter than the corresponding lines in the French poem. For example, the lines 'Plaine paume otestoit ensi formés' is rendered by only 'do-bhí traígh 'na bhél' in translation. An interesting description that is found in both texts is that which relates the size of the giant's ears to a bushel of wheat, showing that the translator was eager to preserve the general information about the giant, without holding on to all the extra poetic phrases. In similar fashion, the next piece of important information, that the giant was the Admiral's constable throughout all his lands, is also represented in the Irish text;

²⁴Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.272.

however, the following non-informative passage was not transmitted to the Irish audience.

The essentials of *laisse* 108 are also given to the Irish reader: indeed, it^{is} the material of the opening two lines of this *laisse* that were used to form the first part of the opening sentence of the Irish text, although with the poetic descriptions 'à grant friçon' and 'ou chief le caperon' omitted. As regards the dialogue between Richard and the giant, the Irish text contains only an abridgement of the speech of Richard, the basic information about the deception being all that is required for the story: the rhetorical nature of the speech in the French poem, where Richard tries to appeal to the giant by appearing humble in front of him, is not found in the translation. Note however the translation of 'Richars torna sa langue' by 'do-chlaechlodh Roisderd tenga dó'; even if 'Aragon' is not actually mentioned in translation, it was necessary to preserve this informative snippet.

8.

(L129)²⁵

Quant Guenelon l'entent, n'est pas assés;
 Il a prins son espiel, dont li fers fu quarrés,
 Enmi li pis feri 1 roi de grant fiertés;
 Parmi le gros du cuer li est li fers passés,
 Si c'as piés l'amirant est li cors enversés.
 Lors guencist vistement, si s'en est retornés;
 L'amirans saut en piés et li cris est levés.
 Sarrazin s'atornerent as loges et as trés,
 Plus de 50 000 sont es cevaus montés,
 Guenelon encaucierent tout le val Josué.
 Namles fut en la tour, li vix cenus barbés,
 As fenestres de marbre où estoit acoutés;
 Rollant et Olivier a andeus apelés.
 "Signeur", dist li dus Namles, "oiés et entendés:

²⁵Kræber & Servois, *op.cit.*, pp.166-7, 1.5495-516.

Là voi 1 chevalier ki de l'ost est tornés,
 Bien a après le dos 50 000 armés,
 N'i a cel de l'ataindre ne soit entalentés;
 Bien sai qu'il est messages et de no tere nés;
 Guenelon me resanble, je l'ai bien avisé."
 "Sire", ce dist Rollans, "c'est fine verités;
 Damedix le garisse, li rois de maïstés,
 Que moult m'en pesera se il est encombrés."

[§225]²⁶ Mar do-chualaidh Ginntilion sin do-bhen a chlaidhem amach co luath, 7 tarrla Brulant dó .i. nech uasal do muinntir Amiranduis, 7 tuc buille dó 7 do-gherr conuige a leth é, 7 fuair bas a fiadnaisi Amiranduis, 7 do-bhí Ginntilion aga dhin orro co ferrda co nachar' lamh nech acu lamh do chur ann, 7 do-bhí Oliverus oc fechain tar fuineogaibh in tuir amach sin, 7 do-chonnaic sé Ginntilion ar techt, 7 adubairt risna ridiri co facaidh sé aen ridire 'na aenar ar techt o Admiranndus, 7 gur doigh lis gurub e Ginntilion é. Ocus adubairt "Is truagh gan a bheith aga furtacht."

Once again, the same events, told in a somewhat summary fashion. Details of description which highlight the journey of Ganelon are omitted or abridged. At the start of the comparison, 'Quant Guenelon l'entent' and 'Il a prins son espiel' are translated literally; however, the Irish text does not contain the following pieces of poetic description, 'n'ese pas assés' or 'dont li fers fu quarrés'. This is a feature of the remainder of this particular episode, where further poetic description^{is} omitted (or replaced by the naming of the Saracen); nevertheless, the feature of the Saracen's death in front of the Admiral is preserved. The aftermath of this deed is described differently: the French poem shows the number of Saracens chasing Ganelon; the Irish text replaces this by a description of the knight's might: '7 do-bhí Ginntilion aga dhin orro co ferrda co nachar' lamh nech acu lamh do chur ann'.

In the second half of these extracts, an interesting difference is the replacement of Namles by Oliver as the speaker, even though 'Neymer' is present in the tower. The

²⁶Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.288.

speech itself is considerably abridged. One method by which this is effected is the rendering of the direct speech into indirect speech in translation; in this way, the text just describes the event that is happening, without using any of the additional descriptive, poetic phrases in the original such as 'oiés et entendés' or 'Bien sai qu'il est messages et de no tere nés'. Note also how the short speech of Roland in the French text is replaced by a small addition to the speech of Oliver in the translation.

9.

(L150)²⁷

Tant vont par lor journées, si com dit li escriis,
 Que à l'uitisme jour sont venu à Paris.
 Cascuns s'en va ou regne dont il estoit nouris;
 Karlemaines s'en va au moustier Saint Denis.
 Là manda arcevesques, evesques benéis,
 Les reliques lor monstre Damedieu Jhesu Cris.
 Cel jour ot 10 evesques ensamble revestis,
 Si i ot arcevesques et abés 36;
 Li barnages i fu d'Orliens et de Paris.

[L151]

Au baron Saint Denis fu grans li assamblée;
 Au peron du lendi fu la messe cantée.
 Illuec fu la couronne partie et devisée:
 Une partie en fu à Saint Denis donnée,
 Et 1 cleu ensemment, c'est verités prouvée.
 De la couronne fu partie et desevrée;
 A Compiegne est li signes à l'eglise honnerée.
 Des saintimes reliques fu là le desevrée;
 Maint present en fist Karles par France la loée:
 Et l'onor Dieu en fu mainte eglise honnerée.
 La foire du Lendi fu par ce estorée,
 Que ja n'i devroit estre cens ne taille donnée.

²⁷Kræber & Servois, *op.cit.*, pp.187-8, l.6186-206.

[§256]²⁸ Ocus is annsin do imigh in t'imper uathu co cumthach, co faidigect móir co rainic co Pairis a cend 20 la on la sin, 7 do-chuadar co Sin Denis annsin, 7 do-fagadh annsin in coroin 7 tairngne dona tairngnibh 7 cuid dona taisibh. [§257] Ocus do-ordaigh in t-imper da éisi sin ecluis do denum a n-onoir na taissi sin isin inadh darub ainm Persibus .i. leo a nuimir míltedh ata idir Pairis 7 Sin Denis, 7 do-ordaigh sé altora 7 othrola 7 aifrinn do beith a n-onoir na taisi sin, 7 ata in gloir sin ag connmail doibh gach lae.

Stokes's paragraphs 256 and 257 together form a short epilogue corresponding to *laissez* 150-1 of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, telling what happened to the Relics after Charlemagne's arrival in Paris. The basic point of these final *laissez* comes through in the translation, as it should do, given its great importance to the interpretation of the text. However, although the delivery of the Relics to St. Denis is mentioned in *Sdair Fortibrais*, there is no mention of Compiegne, or of the establishment of the Foire de Lendit which are prominent in the *Chanson de Fierabras*. On the other hand, the special church that was built after the arrival of the Relics in Paris is prominent in the Irish text, which additionally describes its location between St. Denis and Paris: the allusion to the Sainte-Chapelle is quite obvious.

These observations suggest that local arrangements such as the Lendit fair were not as important a subject to the Irish audience as was the location of the Relics themselves. It is also noticeable how other details of a more local nature, such as the details of the bishops, abbots and baronies at St. Denis, are not included in *Sdair Fortibrais*. The Irish text also has a different journey-time from the region of the action to Paris. Such an alteration of figures has been seen earlier in this section: the preservation of the same numbers does not seem to have been considered essential in translation.

²⁸Stokes, *op.cit.*, pp.378-80.

10.

(L151)²⁹ A Dieu vous comman je, ma canchons est finée.
 De cest roumant est boine et la fin et l'entrée,
 Et enmi et partout, qui bien l'a escoutée;
 Ki cest roumant escrist il ait boine durée.

Explicit li rommans de Fierabras d'Alixandre.

(§258)³⁰ Co tairrnig sdair Serluis móir ag lenmainn coroine Crist 7 taissi na naemh.
 Finit amen finit.

This final section neatly shows the different emphasis of the original *chanson de geste* and the Irish translation. To the Latin translator, this story is the factual history of Charlemagne's rescue of the Crown of Thorns and other relics. To the French poet, the text is fundamentally a literary achievement: the text is a *chanson de geste*, centred on one particular Saracen, which has required skilful narration by the author.

Résumé

The author of *Gesta Karoli Magni* did not attempt to write a new version of the Fierabras story. His intention was to extract the basic information contained in the *Chanson de Fierabras*, and process it in such a way as to tell concisely, but circumstantially, the story of the retrieval of the Relics of the Passion by Charlemagne. The translator aimed to produce a text that read like a history, and not like an epic poem: he wanted the reader to feel that his presentation of the story was indeed the truth behind the Relics which lay in the Sainte-Chapelle, and at St. Denis, where they could be visited by Irish travellers of the kind represented by Simon

²⁹Kræber & Servois, p.188, l.6216-20.

³⁰Stokes, *op.cit.*, p.380.

Semeonis. Indeed, so far as Ireland was concerned, the milieu of the Fierabras story was to be more historical than literary.

Although the medium of Latin prose lent itself more readily to a 'historical' text than did French verse, a literal translation of the *Chanson de Fierabras* into Latin was not necessary to convey the history of the Relics of the Passion. Such a project did not require all the details of descriptions or of dialogue: a general outline was all that was required. Consequently, a number of speeches and descriptive passages were abridged, sometimes quite substantially, in the translation. Additionally, a number the unnecessary poetic descriptions from the *chanson de geste*, especially interjections included for rhythmic purposes, were omitted. Nevertheless, the translator allowed himself a certain freedom to produce his text in the manner which satisfied him: at times he reordered the information of the *Chanson de Fierabras* so as to make the narrative of the Latin text proceed in a more historically coherent manner. At the same time, he added certain pieces of information to elucidate exactly who was present or what was happening at any one particular stage, so that the reader was not left in doubt: he or she could gain a clear understanding of the events that surrounded the theft of the Relics, their subsequent rescue by Charlemagne, and their final transfer to the Île de France.

CHAPTER FIVE***GESTA KAROLI MAGNI* - A SPECIMEN OF
FOURTEENTH-CENTURY HIBERNO-LATIN****SECTION ONE****THE LATINITY OF THE AUTHOR OF *GESTA
KAROLI MAGNI***

Gesta Karoli Magni exemplifies that form of Latinity which has been described by Mario Esposito (in the introduction to his edition of the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis) as 'correct Medieval Latin'¹. This term applies to the Latin used by the authors of a large number of technical and scholastic prose texts, written throughout Europe from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. During this period, regional differences in the use of Latin become considerably more difficult to detect than in the texts written in the previous centuries of the Middle Ages².

Medieval Latin has been described as international³, with the influence of the Latin of the Bible and also of the Church Fathers being of paramount importance to its development⁴. However, it must be noted there was 'no common universal Medieval Latin' in the period up to the thirteenth century⁵. One of the reasons for this non-universality was the influence, in varying degrees, of the vernacular languages. Although the same classical and Christian authors were studied in the monastic and cathedral schools⁶, Latinized forms of vernacular words were used freely, particularly in the Romance-speaking areas⁷.

¹ M. Esposito, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae*, vol. 4, Dublin, 1960, p. 5.

² See further the essay of D. Norberg, 'Le Latin après l'An 1000' in his *Manuel Pratique de Latin Médiéval*, *Connaissances des Langues* vol. 4, Paris, 1968, pp. 68-92.

³ K. Strecker, *An Introduction to Medieval Latin*, Berlin, 1957, p. 38.

⁴ *id.*, pp. 22-4.

⁵ *id.*, p. 38.

⁶ Norberg, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁷ *id.*, p. 69.

This situation changed in the thirteenth century, when a new wave of internationalism spread across the church and the educational system. The impetus for this drive can be seen in the rise to predominance of French civilisation in literature and learning, and the development of the University of Paris as the leading intellectual centre of Europe⁸. The university education system was based upon dialectic and not grammar, with the result that the study of classical authors was replaced by the study of scholastic and philosophical works⁹. Consequently, Latin started being written in a free-flowing 'technical' and less literary manner that has been termed 'scholastic Latin'¹⁰.

In this form of Latin precise modes of expression, using easily intelligible classical and medieval-style sentence structures and constructions, were employed. The students attracted to Paris were able to take this scholastic Latin all over Europe. It is no coincidence that the thirteenth century saw the emergence of both the other Northern Universities, and simultaneously the mendicant orders in which the friars were not members of a particular community but of the whole order on a pan-European scale¹¹. These new institutions enabled a much greater flow of ideas between the various parts of Europe, and encouraged the emergence of a more homogeneous international language.

The situation as regards the use of Latin in post-twelfth-century Ireland is no different¹². The compilers of the most complete bibliography of Celtic Latin Literature have considered Latin in the Celtic-speaking areas as no longer distinctively 'Celtic' after the year 1200¹³. In one other respect Ireland would perhaps

⁸id., p.71.

⁹id., p.89.

¹⁰id., p.90.

¹¹L.K.Little, 'Friars' in J.P.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* vol.5, New York, 1985, p.298.

¹²Norberg, *op.cit.*, p.68, notes Ireland as being within the general scheme of Latin in this period.

¹³M.Lapidge & R.Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature 400-1200*, Dublin, 1985. Although this sentiment is not specifically expressed in the introduction, Professor Lapidge has stated that this is the reason for the terminus ante-quem being 1200.

have been more likely to adopt the international style than many other countries. Since there was never^a university in late medieval Ireland¹⁴, Irish scholars had to travel to Oxford or Paris to seek a university training¹⁵.

All this suggests that the Latin of *Gesta Karoli Magni* will reveal less about the provenance of the text than if it had been written during the early middle ages. It would be extremely difficult to call a text 'fourteenth century' and 'Irish' purely on the basis of its Latinity. The best that can be achieved on linguistic grounds is a descriptive account of the author's Latin prose, noting the extent to which he employed classical or medieval constructions, and identifying distinctive usages in the text. This survey of *Gesta Karoli Magni* will illustrate that its author's Latin was indeed 'correct': that is, he employed the conventional scholastic prose which was used throughout Europe from the thirteenth century.

The following examination of the characteristic modes of expression used in *Gesta Karoli Magni* concentrates on features which show a distinction between classical and medieval scholastic usage, and asks how 'classical' or 'medieval' the text turns out to be¹⁶. Six sets of phenomena have been found particularly amenable to study: first, sentence structure, with special reference to the formation of concatenated sentences with non-embedded subordinate clauses, and increased use of parataxis at the expense of subordination; second, the replacement of the 'accusative + infinitive' construction and 'ut' clauses by clauses introduced by 'quod' or 'ita quod'; third, the formulaic manner in which the author has included 'cum' and 'si' clauses; fourth, the use of

¹⁴See M. Mac Con Mara, MSC, 'Hiberno-Latin Writings 1200-1500' in *Hiberno-Latin Newsletter* 3, 1989, p.9. He also describes here pre-1200 Hiberno-Latin as "Celtic" and post-1200 Hiberno-Latin as "Norman". Note also F. McGrath S.J., *Education in Ancient and Medieval Ireland*, Dublin, 1979, pp.216-8 who notes the foundation of the University of St. Patrick in 1313, but states how by 1320 there was little evidence of scholastic activity.

¹⁵Id., pp.171-9 discusses the Irish at Oxford. Mac Con Mara, *op.cit.*, p.10, lists some of the Irish scholars known to have travelled abroad in this period, for the most part in the later thirteenth and early fourteenth century.

¹⁶For principles and criteria see Rev. H.P.V. Nunn, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin*, Cambridge, 1922, pp.6-7. This volume aims to provide a list of the characteristic 'medievalisms' found in the Vulgate Latin translation of the Bible.

constructions that could be viewed as giving the Latin a more 'classical' feel; fifth, the development of periphrastic verb forms using 'habere', 'esse' and 'facere'; sixth, a survey of any vernacular words which may have crept into the Latin. These features will be considered in turn as they relate to *Gesta Karoli Magni*, as a means to gaining an impression of the Latinity of the text's author¹⁷.

Sentence Structure

The first question concerns the degree of complication found in sentence structure. As the following sections show, *Gesta Karoli Magni* shows that in this respect its author was following the scholastic conventions of the later Middle Ages: sentences are generally uncomplicated, and easy to follow, with the clauses and phrases laid out in a clear, coherent manner.

Typical Sentence Structures

The text alternates between simple and complex sentences¹⁸. Simple sentences are generally used for a brief description of some point.

Example (Simple sentence): Page 85, col.1, l.16-7; §2.

'Longitudo vero ipsius erat quindecim pedum.'

¹⁷When describing the methods of expression, reference will be made to the more detailed analyses of medieval Latin syntax provided by Nunn, *op.cit.*, pp.8-113. Also, reference will be made to the less detailed discussion by Strecker, *op.cit.*, pp.63-8. As both these volumes are unspecific as to the date to which they refer, a third discussion, R.A.Browne, *British Latin Selections A.D. 500-1400*, Oxford, 1954, will in addition be considered. This book includes reference to Britain in the post-twelfth century period, Latin that could well be the closest relative to the Hiberno-Latin of the same period.

¹⁸Nunn, *op.cit.*, p.9, §4-6.

A favourite complex sentence structure employed in narrative contexts is one which cuts down on the main verbs by using present participles in the nominative case to form the subordinate phrases. This structure is not overly ambitious: in the following example, two such present participles are used in a complex sentence which could well have been written as a sequence of simple sentences.

Example(Complex sentence): Page 88, col.2, l.47-9; §43.

'Barones vero de Francia bellum respicientes, valde timuerunt, divinum implorantes auxilium.'

Connective Words¹⁹

Connective words are very important throughout *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The conjunction 'et' is used continually to show connection between two phrases of which neither is subordinate. Its use enables simple sentences to be joined together to form a longer sentence conveying a number of basic ideas while showing very clearly the division between each phrase. The repeated use of 'et' is decidedly medieval: it adheres to the ideals of scholastic prose.

Example (repeated use of 'et'): Page 88, col.1, l.27-9; §37.

'Tunc Fortibras surrexit *et* se evexit *et* longitudo illius protendebat ad quindecim pedes *et* dixit'

Occasionally, 'et' is found joining a subordinate phrase to the main clause of the sentence, its employment appearing to be somewhat unnecessary.

Example (spurious 'et'): Page 89, col.1, l.1-2; §43.

'Fortibras autem irruens in Oliverum, *et* clipeum suum dimediavit ictu solo'

¹⁹Strecker, *op.cit.*, pp.64-5; Browne, *op.cit.*, p.xxv have general discussions on conjunctions.

'Connective' words are also regularly employed to mark the start of a new sentence. A number of such connectives are usually placed after the first word of the sentence, following classical style, to act as markers. However, the two words most frequently used, 'autem' and 'vero'²⁰, have both lost any sense other than that of 'and' or 'then', a scholastic rather than classical feature. (The following words retain more of their original meaning: 'adhuc', 'enim', 'itaque', 'undique', 'equidem'.)

Example (autem): Page 89, col.1, l.3-5; §43.

'Fortibras *autem* accensus percussit Oliverum'

Example (vero): Page 92, col.2, l.7-8; §74.

'Rex *vero* confestim vocavit Turpinum archiepiscopem dicens'

General Patterns of Clause, Phrase and Word Order

In true scholastic fashion, the clauses and phrases of *Gesta Karoli Magni* are ordered so as to be easily intelligible. If the sentence is read from beginning to end, the meaning and the structure are usually comprehended immediately. Within clauses and phrases the word order is generally free from stylistic complication. The verb is placed near its subject and object. Nouns and qualifying adjectives are rarely separated. Prepositions are pre-posed.

Example: Page 89, col.1, l.37-40; §47.

'In illo conflictu Fortibras plagavit Oliverum in pectore, unde ex fluxu tanti sanguinis debilitatur et decoloratur.'

²⁰Strecker, *op.cit.*, p.65 notes the loss of force of some conjunctions.

Example (More Complicated sentence): Page 97, col.1, l.11-4; §110.

"Et ecce, nobis venientibus pro negotio nostro per imperatorem sibi denuntiando, occurrunt glutones xv, qui dextrarios nostros nobis eripere nitebantur."

As is perhaps expected, the first sentence of the story is the most complicated in the whole text. It is coherently structured, and poses no major difficulties to the reader.

First Sentence: Page 85, col.1, l.2-10; §1.

'Post obdormitionem in domino bone memorie venerabilis Helene matris Constantini imperatoris, quae crucem domini nostri Ihesu Christi cum corona ceterisque reliquiis sanctorum, tanquam pia sancte ecclesie filia Ierosolimis, deportavit a Iudeis, cruce divisa per partes, et ad diversa loca sancta per piam devotionem beate ecclesie oblatas, tandem corona cum clavis ceterisque reliquiis pontifici Romano Rome erant oblate.'²¹

One example of the use of a classical stylistic feature in the word order of the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* is the encasing of a genitive noun by an agreeing noun and adjective. The examples in the text are decidedly simple, showing that the author did not wish the path of the narrative to be confused by the reader having to look far ahead to pair the agreeing words.

Example (Encased genitive): Page 86, col.2, l.36-7; §17.

"..... et magno roris fluxu debilitatus."

²¹This paragraph of *Sdair Fortibrais* has already been discussed in the previous chapter, demonstrating the relationship between *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*.

Constructions - Indirect Speech and Final Clauses

Where a clear choice existed it is worth asking whether the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni* preferred to use classical constructions, or to replace them with the standard medieval alternatives. He was clearly familiar with certain classical constructions, and was perfectly capable of writing indirect statements using the accusative + infinitive construction, and of following classical usage in framing final clauses introduced by 'ut'. However, these classical usages are not ubiquitous; for there are also many examples of 'quod' and 'ita quod' employed to introduce both indirect speech and final clauses. The best that can be done to summarise his usage is to say that the translator was at home with both the classical and medieval styles, perhaps a prerequisite for a writer of correct scholastic Latin.

Indirect Statement - Accusative + Infinitive²²

This classical construction of main verb + accusative + infinitive is employed occasionally by the author to relate an indirect statement. At times the infinitive 'esse' is omitted, particularly when the full infinitive is a periphrastic future active.

Example: Page 92, col.1, l.34-5; §72.

"....., fateor *me esse devictum* per Oliverum"

Example: Page 85, col.1, l. 34-6; §4.

'Fortibras vero, ex audito intellegens *regem Karolum venturum*, congregavit sibi"

²²Nunn, *op.cit.*, p.50, §108.

Indirect Statement - Verb + quod + verb²³

The medieval method of expressing an indirect statement is employed more frequently than the classical construction, with 'that' being translated by 'quod' and a finite verb form being used for the indirect statement itself.

Example: Page 88, col.2, l.21-2; §40.

"*Dico tibi certum quod Oliverus vocor, socius et comes Rolandi.*"

Example: Page 89, col.2, l.48-9; §53.

"*Olivere, ego novi quod erravi et pro certo*"

Indirect Command - Verb + ut + subjunctive / Verb + Accusative + Infinitive²⁴

These classical constructions are used in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The verb + 'ut' + subjunctive is the principal method of expressing the indirect command, but 'iubeo' is also used with the accusative + infinitive construction.

Example: Page 88, col.2, l.14-5; §39.

"*Garin, adhuc rogo ut gustes de balsamo,*"

Example: Page 92, col.1, l.48 - col.2, l.1; §73.

'Imperator vero, viscerose compatiens, *iussit* barones suos *ut* suaviter *sisterent* eum super suum clipeum.'

Example: Page 86, col.1, l.14-5; §11.

'Rex ad modum furiens *iussit* astantes illum *capere et ligare*, iurans

²³id., p.51-2, §113; Browne, *op.cit.*, p.xxxi.

²⁴Nunn, *op.cit.*, pp.50-1, §110.

Indirect Commands - Verb + quod + subjunctive²⁵

Occasionally, 'ut' is replaced by 'quod' in this construction, following the more usual medieval pattern.

Example: Page 88, col.1, l.30; §37.

"*Rogo quod facias* prout dixi,"

Purpose Clauses - verb +ut/ne + subjunctive²⁶

The purpose clause, where the subordinate clause shows to what end the action described in the main clause takes place, is well used in *Gesta Karoli Magni* and generally follows the classical pattern.

Example: Page 92, col.2, l.5-6; §73.

'*Accurrerunt* undique Galli *ut* eum *videant*, admirantes.....'²⁷

Example: Page 91, col.1, l.15-9; §63.

"*Peto* pro Ihesu Christo *quod* in eius nomine facias baptizari *ne* me *interficias*."

²⁵Not noted by Nunn. Browne, *op.cit.*, p.xxix notes the indiscriminate use of 'quod' as a conjunction.

²⁶Nunn, *op.cit.*, p.79, §157.

²⁷Note how the classical rule of sequence of tenses has been broken in this example.

Result Clauses - verb + ita quod + verb²⁸

A medieval feature is adopted for the result clause, 'ut' being replaced by 'ita quod', a literal translation of 'so that'.

Example: Page 86, col.1, l.10-11; §11.

'et percussit cum ea Rolandum in dentibus ita quod sanguis emanavit.'

Constructions - Temporal, Causal and Conditional Clauses

These constructions involve the temporal, causal and conditional clauses. In classical Latin, these could be described as the 'cum' and 'si' clauses. Although the author of *Gesta Karoli Magni* was clearly aware of the use of these constructions, he did not follow strict classical rules, particularly in the case of the causal clauses. Also, his employment of the 'cum' and 'si' clauses tends not to be very ambitious, the clauses following a somewhat formulaic pattern that suited the intelligibility of scholastic Latin.

Temporal Clauses - cum + verb²⁹

Temporal clauses are expressed by 'cum' + subjunctive to express an event in the past, in historic sequence. This construction is used throughout *Gesta Karoli Magni*, which employs the subjunctive somewhat more frequently than would be expected in classical Latin³⁰. In primary sequence, when 'cum' has a sense of 'whenever', the future perfect indicative is used.

²⁸Browne, *op.cit.*, p.xxix notes 'in tantum quod' as a typical start to such a clause. Nunn, *op.cit.*, p.81, §163, notes that 'ut' or 'ita ut' are the more general medieval ways of starting such a clause.

²⁹*id.*, p.75, §153.

³⁰In classical Latin, 'cum' meaning 'when' would sometimes take the subjunctive, but not always. If it was used to mean 'since' or 'although', a subjunctive would always be expected: however, it does not tend to be used in either of these senses in *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

Example: Page 91, col.1, l.1-2; §63

'*Cum* vero Fortibras *elevasset* brachium suum cum rigore

Example: Page 89, col.1, l.32-4; §47.

"Olivere, pro consuetudine habeo tunc in bello expedire, *cum videro* sanguinem meum de corpore meo prosilire."

Causal Clauses - ex quo + verb³¹

The distinctive compound conjunction 'ex quo' is used to introduce a clause with the meaning of 'since' or 'because', where 'cum' might be expected in a classical text; in classical Latin, 'ex quo' had more of a temporal force (i.e. 'ex quo tempore'). The following example shows its governing of a verb in the present indicative tense.

Example: Page 85, col.2, l.22-4; §7.

"O, tu Karole, iam video te perterritum, *ex quo* non *venis* nec *mittis* aliquem

Conditional Sentences³²

The conditional clause is used extensively in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, albeit in a rather formulaic fashion. In narrative sequence it expresses the situation 'if something had (or had not) happened, then something else would (not) have happened'. The verbs in both the main and conditional clause are generally in the same tense and mood, which simplifies the whole sentence and renders it easily intelligible to reader. Generally, when the sentence is in secondary sequence, the verbs are in the subjunctive: the most

³¹This clause is noted here although a clause using this conjunction is not discussed by Nunn or Browne.

³²The general patterns of medieval usage of the conditional clauses are discussed by Nunn, *op.cit.*, pp.83-7, §167-73.

distinctive usage is the employment of 'nisi' and two pluperfect subjunctives to express 'if something had not happened, then something else would have happened'³³.

Example (Si + imp. subj.): Page 90, col.2, l.5-7; §58.

"Nam *si interficerem* enso illo quod fiet in brevi ut speram redargui *possem* tanquam ingratus."

Example (Nisi + plup. subj.): Page 85, col.2, l.9-10; §5.

'Et *nisi* Karolus *supervenisset* in auxilium, Rolandus cum xii paribus *fuissent devicti*"

In primary sequence, 'si' and 'nisi' are also used with verbs in the indicative mood to state either that something will happen unless something else is done, or to state that something will not happen unless something else happens first. These verbs in the conditional clauses are usually in the future perfect indicative³⁴.

Example (Si + fut. perf. indic.): Page 100, col.2, l.23-5; §142.

"*Si* vero barbari *praevenierint* et *praeoccupaverint* portam, nulla *est* nobis via evasionis"

Example (Nisi + fut. perf. indic.): Page 85, col.2, l.28-9; §7.

"Non quaequam *teret* dies quin occidam aliquanda Christianiis *nisi* *faveris* petitioni mee."

³³id., pp.84-5, §169.

³⁴id., p.86, §172.

Other Classical Constructions

The ablative absolute and constructions involving the gerundive could probably have been avoided by the writers of scholastic Latin if they had so desired. However, they were employed in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, and their inclusion shows that the author was comfortable using them in his narrative prose. Although there is nothing remarkable about their inclusion in the text, they do indicate that the author of *Gesta Karoli Magni* knew how to use these classical modes of expression.

Ablative Absolute

Considerable use is also made of the ablative absolute, usually at the start of a sentence. It is used in the text when the subject of the introductory subordinate phrase is not the same as that of the main verb³⁵.

Example (Abl. Abs. Pres.): Page 85, col.1, l.10-2; §2.

'*Regnante vero Karolo nobili imperatore* in Francia, pro rege venit unus Admirandus qui

Example (Abl. Abs. Past): Page 88, col.2, l.31-2; §40.

'....., qui *spreto deo suo vivo* et vero colit ydola vana que

³⁵id., pp.22-4, §51.

Gerundive

Although fairly unusual, the author shows no qualms about using the gerundive as a verbal adjective where appropriate³⁶; he did not resort to expressing these ideas by means of, for example, a present participle. Gerundives are most commonly found in the ablative case, following a preposition.

Example (Gerundive): Page 86, col.1-2; l.47-1; §15.

"Nemo valoris desistere debet *a laude propria amplianda* nec *pro honore* imperatoris Karoli *augmentando*."

The gerundive is also used with the sense of obligation: although the author used 'oportet' and parts of the verb 'debere', he did not dispense with this use of the gerundive³⁷. However, the examples in the text tend to be fairly simple and formulaic, suggesting that the author did not want to confuse his text by the Latin being overly ambitious.

Example (Gerund of oblig.): Page 96, col.1, l.16; §105.

"Domine, non *est crepandum* de eis, cum sint non ultra viginti."

Medieval Periphrastic Verbs³⁸

Typically, 'medieval' periphrastic verbs use parts of the verbs 'habere', 'esse' or 'facere' as auxiliaries (as in the vernaculars) to create compound verbal forms which are not characteristic of classical Latin. If there were a large number of verbs in *Gesta Karoli Magni* that had been constructed using these auxiliary verbs, it could be concluded that the author was not overly concerned to use the classical paradigms to their full

³⁶id., pp.94-5, §190.

³⁷id., pp.95-6, §192.

³⁸id., pp.41-2, §90-4.

extent. There are, however, few examples of such verbal forms in *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

'Habere' and 'Esse' as Auxiliaries

Medieval periphrastic verbs, formed using 'habere' and 'esse' as auxiliaries, are not generally used in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, the author preferring to use the classical verb forms. There is only one example using 'habere', a periphrastic pluperfect indicative³⁹, that could be considered a slip of concentration by the translator when translating a French periphrastic pluperfect verb.

Example (habere as auxil.): Page 90, col.2, l.28; §60.

'Fortibras vero periculum illum sic *habuit* brachium *ebetum*,

As regards 'esse', the only thing that can be considered noteworthy is the rather unusual late classical and medieval method employed to express 'he is wounded' in an accusative + infinitive construction that combines 'fore' with a past participle. The translator is trying to express a continuous state; he does not want to use the present passive infinitive that could be taken to be expressing a single action rather than a state⁴⁰.

Example (fore as auxil.): Page 87, col.1, l.21; §21.

""Bene novisti ipsum graviter *fore plagatum*.""

³⁹id., p.42,§93, notes this periphrastic pluperfect.

⁴⁰id., p.41,§91- Nunn does not note this usage of 'fore' but does note a periphrastic future using 'futurus est'.

'Facere' with the passive infinitive

The combination of a part of 'facere' with the present passive infinitive is used in *Gesta Karoli Magni* to express 'to have something done' or 'to make something be done'. This feature cannot be described as a true 'periphrastic' verb, as it has this specific meaning. Nevertheless, it is a feature of Old French narrative style, and the presence of such forms in *Gesta Karoli Magni* hints at the ultimate origin of the text. The fact that it always used with the present passive infinitive is interesting in itself: the author only wanted to use this construction in this one formulaic manner, almost as if to impress the construction upon the reader⁴¹.

Example (facere + pres. pass. inf.); Page 95, col.1, l.11-3; §95.

'Post vero refectionem, *fecit* illos mundissime *balniari*, et sic *fecit* illos iuxta caminum ignis *comfortari*.'

Vocabulary - French and Irish words used in *Gesta Karoli Magni*

Although it has been suggested before that the scholastic Latin of later medieval Ireland would have been less likely to have incorporated Irish words than the early medieval Latin of Spain or Italy, it must still be asked if the author of *Gesta Karoli Magni* did use any words derived from the vernacular. Such a study is particularly expedient for this text, as words from both French and Irish could have found their way into the author's Latin vocabulary. There are a few examples of both French and Irish words in the text: however, they are very few in number and were presumably only used to fill gaps in the author's Latin vocabulary.

⁴¹id., p.42,§94. Also Strecker, *op.cit.*, p.66 and Browne, *op.cit.*, p.xxvii.

French words

There are three examples of nouns that are taken directly from the French text and used in *Gesta Karoli Magni* in a Latin form. The French 'destrier', a war-horse, has been translated by 'dextrarius'. The French form 'vavasor', a vavasor, has also been preserved in the translation. Finally, the French 'batel', a boat, was Latinized to 'batellus'.

Example: Page 87, column 2, l.44-5; §32.

"Ego vero *dextrarium* meum ascendam et"

Example: Page 87, column 2, l.29-30, §30.

"Garinus vocor, de Perigos, filius unius *vavasoris* qui appellatur Iacereth."

Page 96, column 2, l.39-40, §109.

"*Batellus* nec curra vel navis aliquae innatare nequit in ea,"

Another interesting feature is the already discussed name 'Ogerus Le Deneuis', of which the French placename was preserved in translation, perhaps for want of a suitable translation into Latin.

Irish Words

The two words of possible Irish origin are both nouns. The first is the ablative form 'falleris', 'by the palfreys', that appears to be a form of the Irish 'falaire' or 'falaфраigh'. The other potential example has required editorial assistance. Although written as 'cuilla' in the manuscript, with the meaning of boat, 'curra' is a more plausible reading, a Latinized version of the common Irish word 'curach'.

Example: Page 97, column 1, l.31-2, §112.

"Diversa et pretiosa sunt inveniendū cum falleris nostris,"

Example: Page 96, column 2, l.39-40, §109.

"Batellus nec *curra* vel navis aliquae innatare nequit in ea,"

Résumé

This brief survey of some aspects of the Latin in *Gesta Karoli Magni* demonstrates that the author was aware of the basic classical Latin constructions, and used them intermittently, alternating with the more usual or formulaic medieval constructions. As is usually the case with the technical, scholastic Latin of the thirteenth century and afterwards, sentences in *Gesta Karoli Magni* are open-textured and free from stylistic contrivance. On the other hand, the text is restrained in its recourse to such obviously medieval features as the use of periphrastic verbs. The same is true of our author's general avoidance of words borrowed from the vernacular. He demonstrates a sound knowledge of Latin vocabulary and grammatical forms, and is not afraid to display at times his ability to handle the classical constructions, even if his employment of them was not overly complicated or ambitious.

SECTION TWO*GESTA KAROLI MAGNI* AND THE LATINITY OF
SIMON SEMEONIS

It would be advantageous to provide independent grounds to justify the hypothesis that *Gesta Karoli Magni* was translated by an Irishman in the early fourteenth century¹. Given the existence of a scatter of Hiberno-Latin texts which are demonstrably from this period, there are at least grounds for hope that comparative study could shed some light on the question.

There are, of course, limits to the effectiveness of such comparisons, on account of the international character of post-twelfth-century scholastic Latin. All that could be said, if general stylistic similarities were diagnosed, is that *Gesta Karoli Magni* would not be out of place linguistically among the corpus of early fourteenth-century Hiberno-Latin texts. Equally, there is no easy way to assign a precise date to a Hiberno-Latin text on purely linguistic grounds: as has been discussed previously, the text could have been written in the thirteenth, fourteenth or fifteenth century. In order for such comparisons to be effective, there needs to be a significant number of shared peculiar features, ideally a combination of stylistic and grammatical phenomena. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that *Gesta Karoli Magni* possesses features which could be described as stylistically or linguistically peculiar.

It is possible to argue, however, that if there were grounds of a quite different sort for linking *Gesta Karoli Magni* with another text, it would be worth sifting the linguistic and stylistic evidence more minutely, and that in those circumstances the absence of dissimilarity, and 'a fortiori' the presence of shared features, could have at least corroborative force. On that basis, the earlier observation may be recalled that one other Hiberno-Latin text, the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis², makes use of the

¹ As discussed in Chapter 2, section 2.

² ed.M.Esposito, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* vol.4, Dublin, 1960.

same basic subjects - the Relics of the Passion in Paris and the Saracens of Egypt. In view of this thematic correspondence, it may at least be asked whether *Gesta Karoli Magni* could have been translated by Simon Semeonis himself, perhaps with a view to explaining the earlier history of the Christian/Saracen conflict, and the transfer of the Relics of the Passion (which Simon had personally seen in the Sainte-Chapelle) to Paris.

There follows an analysis of some aspects of the Latin of the *Itinerarium*, including sentence structure, the use of classical and medieval constructions, and vocabulary, using the same basic categories that were chosen in the previous section when examining the Latin of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. However, before this analysis is made, it has seemed sensible to consider briefly two other aspects of the *Itinerarium* which could indicate in advance if the texts might have shared a common author. The first aspect entails the manner in which the text describes the Relics of the Passion; the second concerns the general literary style of the *Itinerarium*. If the manner of description of the Relics and the general literary style appear to be almost identical, then weight could certainly be added to any case for common authorship³.

The *Itinerarium* - Description and Literary Style

The Relics of the Passion in the *Itinerarium*

The first requirement in this preliminary discussion is to answer the following thematic question: do any of the details of the Fierabras story concerning the Relics of the Passion manifest themselves in the *Itinerarium*? It has been stated earlier how the primary reason for the translation of *Gesta Karoli Magni* was to bring the story of the Relics of the Passion to the attention of the Irish, thus making a visit to the Sainte-

³Note: all the quotations taken from the *Itinerarium* are printed with the appropriate paragraph number from the edition of Esposito, *op.cit.* .

Chapelle more rewarding⁴. It would then seem likely that had Simon been the translator, there would be certain points of overlap between the two texts. How, therefore, did Simon talk of the Relics of the Passion preserved in Paris?

§6. '....., venimus Sanctum Dyonisium, In quorum ecclesia inter sacras alias reliquias vidimus unum clavum de illis, quibus erat Dominus crucis patibulo manibus militaribus affixus.'

§7. '....., in quo est illa pulcherrima atque famosa capella biblicis historiis mirabiliter ornata. In qua sunt pretiosissimae reliquiae, videlicet corona Domini spinea integra et incorrupta, magna et gloriosa crux de ligno sanctae crucis salutifere, duo clavi quibus erat Dominus cruci conclavatus, lancea, ut dicitur, militis Longini qua apertum fuit latus eiusdem, de quo exivit sanguis et aqua testante Johane ewangelista, lac de mamilla gloriosae Virginis, de capillis eiusdem, et multae aliae nobiles ac venerabiles sanctorum et sanctarum reliquiae, quae omnes a praedicto rege singulari diligentia reverenter custodiuntur.'

In these two passages concerning both St. Denis and the Sainte-Chapelle, it is noticeable how the *Itinerarium* does not refer to Charlemagne's rescue of the Crown of Thorns from the Saracens. It seems improbable that Simon would not have referred to such an event if he himself possessed the knowledge contained in the Fierabras story, which leads to the idea that he was certainly not familiar with the Fierabras story prior to the compilation of the *Itinerarium*. It can also be seen that he does not refer to Helena in the description of the Sainte-Chapelle, even though he was aware of the long-established story of her discovery of the True Cross⁵; of course, this story is represented in a window in the Sainte-Chapelle, and also in the Irish Fierabras tradition.

These observations do not necessarily mean that Simon was not the author of *Gesta Karoli Magni*: he may not have come across the story by the time he composed the

⁴See Chapter 2, Section 2.

⁵§96. '....., per quam descenditur ad locum ubi Helena, Constantini mater, invenit lignum crucis,

Itinerarium. Alternatively, it is possible that he was consciously trying to avoid the inclusion of 'history' in his account. It is unfortunate, however, that these passages do not yield any further pieces of evidence in themselves: if Simon had talked about Charlemagne and the Saracens at the same time as the Relics, Simon's Latinity could have been considered with ^{the} case for common authorship more strongly supported.

Literary Style

Simon was concerned with presenting a considerable amount of detailed information, using a wide range of vocabulary, and he was not always concerned with economy of expression. In this respect, the *Itinerarium* differs from *Gesta Karoli Magni*. Could, therefore, the two texts have been written by the same man? It could be argued that the purpose of translating the *Chanson de Fierabras* was to provide a small amount of essential historical information, whereas the *Itinerarium* served to provide an extensive range of data about the Middle East. Here follows the first half of §43, an example of the 'non-economical' style of Simon.

§43. 'Haec autem terra inter totius mundi terras est nobilissima et formosissima, ratione suae magnae pulcritudinis et ubertatis, magnae pulcritudinis et amenitatis, magnae opulentie et locupletationis, magnae planitudinis et levitatis et etiam magnae fortitudinis et firmitatis. Quae quamvis super omnes mundi regiones sit habundans in fructibus, et signanter infrumento, ordeo, fabis, succuro, bombace, et canna fistulis, tamen in pomis et piris, quae in occidentalibus regionibus reperiuntur, totaliter est sterilis et infructuosa. Ipsa etiam omne tempore, anni tempore inundationis fluvii excepto, variarium herbarum et rosarum floribus decoratur et pulcrificatur, qui suo vigore delectant visum, suo odore olfaciunt olfactum et suo sapore reficiunt gustum. Et hinc est quod in aqua rosacea odoriferissima et apicem perfectionis. Ipsa etiam boves nutrit mire magnitudinis et altitudinis, et oves velut boviculas, quarum quaedam habent caudas semiotundas, pingues nimis, latissimas atque lanosas, quandoque lxx libras ponderantes, quaedam vero grossas, pingues, lanosas, et talaes, quarum omnium lana optima est, quamvis grossa.'

Although this passage shows a number of features, such as alliteration, repetition and unusual vocabulary, this extract does not rule out the idea that Simon was the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. It is certainly possible that one author writing two separate texts with two different natures should seek to employ variations in style so as to ensure that the two texts were seen as independent creations. Again, this is unfortunate, as it means that the examination of the Latinity of Simon starts with nothing further to support the idea of a common authorship for the *Itinerarium* and *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

The Latin of the *Itinerarium* of Simon Semeonis

Sentence Structure

On the surface, the sentence structure and word order of the Latin of the *Itinerarium* are very alike those of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. There are a sizeable number of points of comparison between the texts. However, the similarities are by no means universal, and there are also a number of small points of difference between the two texts, where the relative weight needs to be determined. Some are to be explained by differences in the underlying nature of the texts, and the differences in the subject matter

The *Itinerarium* makes much use of the basic simple sentence. In complex sentences, a typical method of connecting the subordinate phrases to the main clause is the use of present participles, as in *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

§2. 'Et inde per terram *recedentes*, transivimus per'

A number of the most basic connectives, such as 'autem' and 'vero' are used in the *Itinerarium* as in *Gesta Karoli Magni* to mark the beginning of sentences, having lost much of their classical force. However, there are differences in the use of

conjunctions: 'ac/atque' is continually used in the *Itinerarium* for 'and', whereas 'et' is exclusively used in *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

The basic clause and word order rules of the *Itinerarium* are the same as those of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. There are no rhetorical effects, little 'nesting', and no obscuring. As in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, encased genitive are occasionally found, a relatively rare example of departure from the plain style.

§26. 'Vero circa horam sextam, venit prefatus Admiraldus, ut moris est, et turba copiosa cum ipso, cum gladiis et fustibus, et sedens in memorata porta precepit ut bona mercatorum coram eo librentur que erant in civitatem introducenda, ut librata introducantur, et si qui introducendi essent, sibi representarentur.'

§7. (Encased Gentitive) '.... corona Domini spinea'

Constructions - Indirect Speech and Final Clauses

As in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, the *Itinerarium* uses both classical and medieval-style constructions. However, some of the constructions offering classical and medieval options which are common in *Gesta Karoli Magni* are rare or absent in the *Itinerarium*, perhaps on account of the descriptive nature of the text. Nevertheless, there is a sufficient body of evidence to make discussion worthwhile.

Like *Gesta Karoli Magni*, both forms of indirect statement are used, and there is no overwhelming preference for either method. Simon seems to have been at home using both kinds of construction.

§26 '..., qui non credunt *Machometum esse prophetam Dei et nuntium*.'

§32 '*Dicunt etiam quod* parvulis non datur gratia in baptismo.'

The classical 'indirect command' is employed very rarely in the *Itinerarium*, as there are few places in which the indirect command is required. However, the medieval construction with 'quod' is not employed at all for this purpose.

§26 '.... *praecepit ut bona mercatorum coram eo librarentur*,'

The classical form of the purpose clause is also used rarely in the *Itinerarium*.

§26 '....*praecepit*, *ut librata introducantur*,'

The result clause using 'ita quod' + verb is lacking from this text. (On the occasion in §30 on which 'ita quod' is used, Simon is quoting from *De Doctrina Machumet*.)

Constructions - Temporal, Causal and Conditional Clauses

The following uses of these clauses show a certain consistency with the usage of these types of clauses in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. However, there are not as many examples in the *Itinerarium* as in *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

The temporal clause is represented in historic sequence, using pluperfect subjunctive verbs. Occasional examples of a temporal clause in primary sequence with a future perfect verb are quotations from other texts.

§74. 'Quod *cum* ego *conspexissem*, et *considerassem*, mox *incepti dicere*.'

The distinctive causal clause using 'ex quo' as a conjunction is also occasionally found in the *Itinerarium*.

§29. '....., *ex quo* uxore et concubyna caret,'

The conditional clauses are all represented in the *Itinerarium*, although not to the same extent as in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. There is less frequent use of the indicative in conditional clauses; but the text is a report, and most sentences are in secondary sequence.

§48. '...., et *si* plus *diceremus*, venientis limites non *transgrederemur*.'

§85. '.... et plura *si* *habuissemus*,, *portassent*.'

§41. 'Hic autem fluvius *posset* in multis aliis a predictis commendari, *nisi esset* quedam animalia pessima residentes in eo,'

§27. '.... *si* quas secum *detulerint*,'

Other Classical Constructions

Both the ablative absolute and the gerundive are employed frequently in the *Itinerarium*. As in *Gesta Karoli Magni*, the ablative absolute is found at the start of a sentence to connect phrases with different subjects.

§1. (Abl.Abs.) '*Culmine* honoris *spreto*, ac *aliis noxiis* morarum *dispendiis* totaliter *sublatis*,'

The gerundive is used in a similar, rather formulaic manner to *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The gerundive generally follows a preposition except when used with the sense of obligation: this last construction is usually seen as an introductory formula.

§57. '.... *ad hauriendam* aquam,'

§23. (Oblig.) 'Hic autem *sciendum est* quod'

Medieval Periphrastic Verbs

The medieval periphrastic verbal forms with 'habere' and 'esse' are not used in the *Itinerarium*, and there are no examples of 'fore' with the past participle, or of 'facio' with the passive infinitive in Simon's text. (There are some examples of the latter usage but they occur in quotations from the Bible or *De Doctrina Machumet*.) However, there is one example of 'facio' used with an active infinitive, a construction that does not occur in *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

§76. '.... et illos *facit vivere* quos occidit.'

Vocabulary

There are a number of less usual words common to both texts, of which the following list is a selection. However, they are not words that are unusual in the scholastic vocabulary. They merely indicate that *Gesta Karoli Magni* was composed by someone who had learned the same vocabulary as Simon.

	<i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i>	<i>Itinerarium</i>
'Spretus', 'Scorned'	Page 88, col.2, l.31, §40	§1
'Ymum', 'Ground'	Page 97, col.1, l.35, §112	§1
'Galicus', 'French(man)'	Page 91, col.2, l.15, §67	§4
'Inclitus', 'Famous'	Page 86, col.2, l.13, §16	§12
'Miliare', 'Mile'	Page 91, col.2, l.42, §68	§24
'Lucror', 'I gain'	Page 88, col.1, l.25, §36	§27.
'Dito', 'I enrich'	Page 86, col.2, l.29, §16	§27.
'Quousque', 'Until'	Page 96, col.2, l.16, §108	§32
'Guttur(izans)', 'Throat'	Page 99, col.1, l.26, §128	§32
'Sericus', 'Silk'	Page 86, col.1, l.41, §14	§33
'Catena', 'Fetter'	Page 97, col.1, l.34, §112	§37
'Balsamus', 'Balsam'	Page 88, col.1, l.18, §35	§57

Conversely, certain basic words differ in the two texts. It has already been noted above how the *Itinerarium* continually employs 'ac/atque' for 'and', a word never used in *Gesta Karoli Magni*. Other examples are as follows: 'tanquam', frequent in *Gesta Karoli Magni* is not used to any great extent in the *Itinerarium*, 'quasi' being used invariably; 'quamvis' is frequently employed in the *Itinerarium*, whereas there are no examples of it in *Gesta Karoli Magni*; people and places in *Gesta Karoli Magni* are first introduced by the distinctive word 'vocabolo', which is not used in the *Itinerarium*, where 'nomine' (singular) and 'nuncupatur' (plural) being employed almost exclusively; finally, 'oportet' + infinitive is not used in the *Itinerarium* (unlike *Gesta Karoli Magni*), with 'necesse est' + 'ut' + subjunctive being used as an alternative.

Résumé

The examples listed above show that there are undoubted similarities between the *Itinerarium* and *Gesta Karoli Magni*, in respect of grammar, syntax and sentence structure. However, there are significant differences, notably in the choice of certain basic words. If the texts had been written by the same author, a greater correlation in these matters might have been expected, even allowing for the fact that the *Itinerarium* is reportage and *Gesta Karoli Magni* a translation of poetry.

To sum up, both *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the *Itinerarium* are written in a similar scholastic fashion. Indeed, it can be suggested that *Gesta Karoli Magni* would not have seemed out of place alongside the work of Simon Semeonis in the Hiberno-Latin tradition. However, it is impossible to conclude that the two texts were the work of one man. Some of the discrepancies may potentially be accounted for by the travelogue nature of the *Itinerarium*; but others, such as the basic words chosen, cannot be. It can, therefore, be suggested as the most probable conclusion that Simon

was not the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. However, the translator was someone of the same educational background, who was able to compose scholastic Latin in the same manner as Simon.

Bearing in mind Simon's non-reference to Charlemagne in his description of the Relics of the Passion, it would seem likely that the Fierabras story, which can only have started its wider circulation from the later thirteenth century, had not yet reached the attention of Simon by the time of his journey. However, this conclusion would not necessarily imply that *Gesta Karoli Magni* had not been translated by 1323-4; it may well have been inspired by another pilgrimage made along the same lines to that of Simon. Consequently, the comparison between *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the *Itinerarium* does not permit any further definite conclusions to be drawn about the dating of or about the identity of the translator of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. It can only be said that the translator was translating a text that illustrated the historical background to some of the observations that could be made on a journey from Ireland to Paris, and on to the Holy Land, using information that did not conflict with the contemporary accounts of travellers to these places.

CONCLUSION TO PART ONE

The previous chapters have enabled a contextualisation of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais*. The Latin translation of the *Chanson de Fierabras* was made, presumably by an Irishman, at a date most likely to have been in the early fourteenth century, and with the apparent intention of rendering the history of the transfer of the Relics of the Passion from Rome to Paris in the time of Charlemagne into a linguistic and literary medium that was acceptable to the Irish literati of the later Middle Ages. The Latin of the translation is perfectly compatible with the international scholastic Latin used throughout this period of history. The translator may well have been inspired to translate the text after having paid a visit as a scholar or pilgrim to the Sainte-Chapelle, where the Relics were then preserved; the example of Simon Semeonis shows the visit of an Irishman to this Gothic masterpiece, although it can not be concluded that it was Simon himself who translated *Gesta Karoli Magni* from the French.

At a date around the beginning of the fifteenth century, *Gesta Karoli Magni* was translated very carefully into Irish, ostensibly to inform a wider audience of the history of the Relics of the Passion, although there may well have been a hidden political nuances, of which the most plausible are anti-English. This translation became very popular, and was copied into a relatively large number of manuscripts. By the end of the fifteenth century it had come to form part of a history of Charlemagne and the Saracens, the second part being a translation of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*. In many ways, the fifteenth century manuscript tradition reflects the currency of the Fierabras story in France and England during this century.

Sdair Fortibrais is a representative text of what could be called the later (or fifteenth century) translation tradition, which witnessed the translation of the 'Matter of France' material concerning Charlemagne and the 'Matter of Britain' material derived from English romances. The Relics of the Passion formed an important part of this tradition, in which the Grail story was the only representative of Arthurian literature translated into Irish. The subject matter of the Fierabras story was not alien to the Irish tradition. Other texts, both annalistic and narrative, in Hiberno-Latin and Irish share the same set of preconceptions and beliefs. Thus the Saracens are the enemies of Christendom, and inhabit the Southern Mediterranean. France is the country of romance and chivalry which holds the Relics of the Passion, and leads the hosts of Christendom against the infidels. Since France is also a country with which England is often at war, it may well be felt that there is a sub-text here; but any interpretation is left to the reader.

The foregoing chapters have, it is hoped, presented *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* not in isolation but, so far as proved possible, in their historical and literary setting. Of course, a number of interesting studies could be developed from each chapter: some of Irish concern, and some of whose importance lies in the history of European literature as a whole. On the Irish side one would dearly like to see, for example, a survey of all Irish literature (in the widest sense) that reflects the influence upon Ireland of a single political event, such as the Great Schism. If all the available literature in circulation during that period were to be examined, it would become clearer whether a case for the political interpretation of texts of Irish provenance could be made. In addition, a considerably more detailed survey of the Latinity of writers in later medieval Ireland could usefully be undertaken.

On a wide, European plane, noting the importance of the Relics of the Passion in the Irish and European traditions, it would be interesting to investigate the cults (as it were) of the Crown of Thorns and of the Holy Grail in later medieval literature: the former, preserved in the Sainte-Chapelle, associated with the heroic French champion Charlemagne and the royal monastery of St. Denis; the latter, a mythical vessel, associated with the romantic British King Arthur and the remotely located monastery at Glastonbury. How was each of these Relics perceived by the various social estates, and was the interpretation the same in each country?

A narrower but still broadly European topic, concerns the probably thirteenth-century translations into Welsh and Old Norse. Having noted that almost all the texts translated into Welsh were also translated into Old Norse, a most interesting study, from a literary-history point of view, may be discerned in the assessment in greater detail of the extent to which there may have a literary continuum embracing the Hebrides and the West Coast of Britain during this time. It also needs to be asked whether a common pool of French literary texts was being studied in areas under Welsh and Norwegian influence, from which the Irish were, for whatever reasons, excluded. And if a Welsh-Norse connection could be established, were the tastes of the Welsh literati and patrons influencing the choice of texts to be translated into Old Norse, or vice versa, and were the literati of one area passing their ideas to those of the other?

What this project has shown is that in order to understand the position of texts, such as those which form the Irish Fierabras tradition, in the cultural context of the later Middle Ages, it is necessary to think at a European level. Literature does not stand alone either: it is also necessary to consider other media of artistic expression, for example architecture. Equally, contemporary political developments have to be borne in mind. It

is fortunate that the period under consideration in this thesis has one dominant culture, that may be broadly termed 'Gothic', which spread out from the Île de France to influence Western Europe in the later Middle Ages. It is against the convenient limits set by the flourishing of this Gothic culture that a precise historical and literary framework can be established for the study of later medieval literature, including those texts which form the Irish translation tradition. The monuments of the Gothic artistic aesthetic are manifold, and the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle to accommodate the Crown of Thorns, which provided the impetus for the spread of the Fierabras story to all areas within the French cultural sphere, including Ireland, can be considered as one of the pinnacles of Gothic achievement.

PART TWO

MANUSCRIPT, TEXT AND TRANSLATION

SECTION ONE**PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP ON T.C.D. MS. 667 AND
*GESTA KAROLI MAGNI***

The principal aim of the second part of the thesis is to present the 'editio princeps' of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. Prior to the edition, it is appropriate to provide a description of the manuscript in which the text is preserved. This description will give an indication of the date when the manuscript was written and compiled, and give a suggestion of which group of readers would have made use of it. At the end of the description, it should prove easier to answer further questions such as why only half the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* is extant, and why it is found in this particular manuscript.

The manuscript and *Gesta Karoli Magni* have been studied to a certain extent by earlier scholars. The work of these scholars must be briefly surveyed in order to show how the manuscript and *Gesta Karoli Magni* have been analysed up to the present time. This first section gives a short history of the scholarship concerning the manuscript and the Latin translation so that the state of knowledge concerning these subjects at the present time can be established, thus laying the foundations for further observations and discussion. It is to be hoped that a description of the manuscripts which combines the ideas of the earlier scholars with some more detailed observations made during the process of editing *Gesta Karoli Magni* will provide a more accurate history of the manuscript, and enable satisfactory answers to be given to the issues raised above.

There have been two distinct periods of work concerning MS. 667 and *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The first occurred during the early twentieth century, in particular during the Inter-War years. It involved the observation of the manuscript and the text *Gesta Karoli Magni*, and drew the attention of scholars to these items in the process. The second, which has been occurring during the last decade, has sought to catalogue and

classify the manuscript and the text, in order to place them in their historical contexts and to facilitate further study.

Early Twentieth Century

The early-twentieth-century work began in 1900 with the manuscript catalogue of Thomas Abbot¹, who described the manuscript as T.C.D. MS. 667, formerly MS. F.5.3., a Latin manuscript from fifteenth-century Ireland. There is no acknowledgement of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The first mention of *Gesta Karoli Magni* was made by Thomas O'Rahilly², who, in commenting on *Sdair Fortibrais*, stated a belief that the Irish text was a translation of the Latin text contained in MS. F.5.3.

This view was echoed by Robin Flower³ who, while describing the copy of *Sdair Fortibrais* contained in MS. Egerton 1781, stated that the Irish text was translated from the Latin version of the Fierabras story preserved only in MS. F.5.3.. Following further study of the manuscript, Flower⁴ noted MS. F.5.3. as being an interesting manuscript written c.1454 in a Franciscan house in County Clare that contained versions of Latin texts which served as originals for a number of Irish translations. He concluded that the Irish Fierabras tradition came through the Franciscans in a Latin shape.

Paul Grosjean⁵ then went on to describe *Gesta Karoli Magni* as being an otherwise unknown recension, the first scholar to note the unique nature of this version of the

¹T.K.Abbot, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin*, Dublin, 1900, p.112.

²T.F. O'Rahilly, review of *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* by D.Hyde in *Studies* 8, 1919, p.669.

³R. Flower, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Library* vol.2, London, 1926, p.527.

⁴R. Flower, 1927 lecture entitled 'Ireland in Medieval Europe' printed in *The Irish Tradition*, Oxford, 1947, pp.107-41. But he has not explained how he has obtained his information about the origin of the text.

⁵P. Grosjean, 'Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Latinorum Bibliothecarum Dublinensium', in *Analecta Bollondiana*, 46, 1928, pp.106-7. States the manuscript was written by one Donald O'Maelechlaind.

Fierabras story. This fact then interested Mary O'Sullivan⁶, an editor of an English Fierabras romance. She mentioned MS. 667, saying that it contained a unique Latin version of the Fierabras story.

The final article in this period was written by Mario Esposito⁷ in 1936. Following the observations made by Flower, this article gave a description of the manuscript that included page numbers and dimensions. Esposito noted that the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* was only half complete, although he was not sure if there were missing leaves in the manuscript or if the rest of the text had not been copied. Observing that the Irish translation *Sdair Fortibrais* was complete, and by assuming that the Irish text was translated from the Latin, he proposed that an earlier manuscript of the Latin version must have existed. However, he was unable to identify a source for the Latin text.

The Last Decade

During the last decade, there have been four classifications of MS. 667 and *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The first, in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographicarum Latinorum Novum Supplementum*⁸, places *Gesta Karoli Magni* in the section of Charlemagne texts which concerns the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus*, demonstrating the importance of the Relics of the Passion in the text.

⁶M. O'Sullivan, *Fierabras and Otuel*, Early English Text Society vol.198, London, 1935, p.xxi., n.5.

⁷M. Esposito, 'Une Version Latine du Roman de "Fierabras"' in *Romania* 62, 1936, pp.534-41. Distinguishes only three scribes. Edits the final sentence of *Gesta Karoli Magni* thus: 'Guido videns Glariozal cum tanto impetu procedere direxit se ad eum.' The transcription 'Glariozal' is not correct - the reading should be 'Clarionem'.

⁸H.Fros (ed.), *Bibliotheca Hagiographicarum Latinorum Novum Supplementum*, Brussels, 1986, p.181.

MS. 667 was then listed by André de Mandach⁹ in a list of 'all' the extant manuscripts containing a version of the story of Fierabras, in an attempt to show the diffusion of the story throughout Europe. This group of manuscripts is seen as part of the subsection of texts of the British Isles, although a direct source text for the translation is not identified.

By examining all the contents of the manuscript, Mairtin Mac Con Mara¹⁰, in his discussion of ecclesiastical learning on Irish soil between 1200 and 1500, considers MS. 667 as one of two manuscripts which display evidence for the type of texts which were being read, copied and possibly translated in the Franciscan milieu.

The final reference to MS. 667 dates from 1991. Marvin Colker¹¹ provides by far the most complete description of the manuscript. As stated previously by Flower, the manuscript is considered to have been written in the scriptorium of a Franciscan house in County Clare. The dating of the manuscript is approximated to the last date contained in the brief chronicle of Irish history, i.e. 1455. The quality of the parchment is described as rough. The codicological make-up of the manuscript is described by means of listing each quire along with a numeral which shows the number of folios within the quire; for example, the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* is quire no. vi⁸. The scripts of the Latin texts are described as a mixture of Anglicana and Secretary (current and semi-current) forms, with capitals in red and initials in blue or red. Significantly, for the first time it is mentioned that there were many hands involved in the writing of the manuscript, and not just the one or three previously postulated.

⁹ A. de Mandach, *Naissance et Développement de la Chanson de Geste en Europe* vol.5, Geneva, 1987, pp.172-3. This list does not contain all the manuscripts containing the Irish *Sdair Fortibrais*.

¹⁰ Fr. M. Mac Con Mara, *An Léann Eaglasta in Éirinn, 1200-1500*, Dublin, 1988, pp.104-5.

¹¹ M. Colker, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin*, vol.2, Scholar Press, Aldershot, 1991, pp.1123- 64.

Résumé

When all the work of these scholars is taken together, a starting point can be established for further research into the manuscript and *Gesta Karoli Magni*. The manuscript is datable to around the year 1455, and was probably written in a Franciscan house in County Clare. It is made up of a number of quires and written by several hands. It contains ecclesiastical material of use to the Franciscans, and texts which were the versions used as source material by the Irish translators. Among these is a unique, but incomplete, copy of a text which is a Latin version of the Fierabras story. Entitled *Gesta Karoli Magni*, this text is the only extant representation of the source text of *Sdair Fortibrais*.

SECTION TWO**T.C.D. MS. 667 - NOTES ON THE CODEX AND THE
SCRIPT**

The next stage in the consideration of MS. 667 is to give a codicological description of the manuscript and to discuss the principal script used for the Latin texts. These remarks are based on observations made during the process of transcribing *Gesta Karoli Magni*. Such a description is useful as a way of justifying the validity of the history of the manuscript as constructed by previous scholarship.

The first task is to describe the manuscript as a physical codex, and to show in what manner ink was applied to the pages of vellum. The key point to be considered here concerns the quality of the manuscript. If it had been written to store texts of interest to Franciscan friars themselves and not for an aristocratic patron, it would not be expected to be a manuscript of especially high quality¹. What has proved to be the best way to answer the question of quality is a short study of the following specific aspects of the manuscript: the structure of the codex, the quality of the vellum, the ruling of the pages, the quality of the handwriting, and finally the type of decoration used on the pages.

The natural progression from this discussion is an account of the script used by the scribes of all the quires of MS. 667 relevant to this enquiry, in particular the quires containing *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*². The type of script used should also be indicative of the quality of the manuscript, and it will also provide valuable information to support the idea that the manuscript was written around the middle of the fifteenth century. For not only will the script will be attributable to a certain place and date, the abbreviations used by the

¹Quality compared to, for example, the Books of Hours of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

²See Part One, Chapter 2, section 2 for a discussion of manuscript contents.

scribes when writing the texts will also suggest the dating of the relevant quires of the manuscript to a particular century.

There is a further important reason for this description of the manuscript at the present time. The quire of the manuscript containing *Gesta Karoli Magni*, despite being very similar to the majority of the other quires containing Latin texts, does not always share exactly the same characteristics as them. These variations will be discussed in greater detail in the next section, and they will help build a more precise picture of the history of the compilation of the manuscript. However, a discussion of the distinguishing features would not be possible without this more general overview of the manuscript to provide the comparative material. Note that reference is made to the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* on a number of occasions in this section, showing that in spite of the variations, it can still be considered as an integral part of the manuscript.

The Codex - Structure, Vellum and Ink Application

Structure of the Codex

MS. 667 is made up of a number of quires which are not of equal size³. The majority of them contain Latin texts, of which most, but not all, are written in an Anglicana script, and the quires written in the same script are not always written by the same scribe. There are a few quires containing Irish texts inserted at the end of the manuscript. Not all the quires are present, as is known by the missing portion of *Gesta Karoli Magni*. Also, certain quires are not complete, with certain folios missing from them⁴.

³M.Colker, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts in the Library of T.C.D.* vol.2, Scholar Press, Aldershot, 1991, p.1132, shows the quires varying from 6 to 14 folios.

⁴ibid.

This structure is not one of high quality. The manuscript looks as if it incorporates a large amount of information joined together without any particular coherence. A high quality manuscript would be expected to comprise quires of a more equal length, all written in the same script using the same language. This structure is that of an encyclopaedic manuscript which would have been used as a compendium of information, such as the information of use to a group like the Franciscans⁵.

Quality of Vellum

The vellum used throughout MS. 667 is not of the highest quality⁶. It has a brown, speckled appearance, some pages being considerably darker and more speckled than others. A large number of the folios are quite rough to the touch. The pages are not of equal thickness, and are not without flaws: there are a small number of holes in the vellum around which the scribes have written.

Higher quality manuscripts were constructed with a much finer, smoother vellum, generally with a lighter colour and a much less speckled appearance. Any folios containing holes were not generally used. The sort of 'cheap' vellum employed in MS. 667 would have been ideal for the recording of a large amount of information that was to be used for reference purposes.

Page Ruling

The pages of MS. 667 are line-ruled and margined, that is the lines on which the text is written are drawn by pen, columns divided by similarly drawn margins. This is a

⁵Compare to Irish language manuscripts such as the Book of Ballymote and Book of Lismore. Although written for patrons, they contain a vast number of texts placed in one volume for reference.

⁶Unlike, for example, the vellum of the Book of Kells. The vellum of the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* will be described in the next section.

feature of later medieval manuscripts of low to medium quality; earlier and more up-market manuscripts had their lines ruled by hard-point pricking and ruling⁷.

With the exception of the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni*, the quires containing Latin texts have columns measuring 17.7 x 5 cm, with 0.4 cm between each ruled line, and 0.8 cm between the adjacent margins of the two columns. There are 2.3 cm between the base of the column and the bottom of the page, with slight variation of 1 or 2 mm⁸. The small spaces between the various ruled lines means that the text is written with a very high density on the page, with small letters and spaced used, and with a considerable number of abbreviations employed. This again is not the sign of a high-quality manuscript, but would be ideal for the storage of a large volume of information in a compact form.

Quality of Handwriting

The texts are written on the ruled lines, mostly in inks of varying shades of brown. A number of hands are present in the writing of the Latin texts. However, it is not the work of high-quality scribes. The texts are written in handwriting that is perfectly legible, but not exquisitely neat. These texts were not designed to be calligraphic masterpieces, but to have a functional legibility.

There are a number of mistakes in the texts⁹. Many of these have gone unnoticed, and not all of those that are have been corrected by neat use of the punctum delens. Some have red lines scored through them, and others are corrected by means of a red or blue ink correction or insertion - not high quality features. Another feature that is not of high quality is the use of the caret mark (or other such symbols) to insert omitted

⁷M.P.Brown, *A Guide to Western Historical Scripts from Antiquity to 1600*, London, 1990, p.4.

⁸The quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* will be discussed in detail in the next section.

⁹Noticed by inspection, as well as in the editing of *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

letters or words both interlinearly and in the margins. There appears to have been no thought to rewrite the page - there would have been no need if a codex had a purely functional purpose.

Decoration

The only decoration on the manuscript is the rather crude infilling of capital letters by red, and sometimes blue¹⁰, ink. However, these infills are not always correct - not infrequently the wrong word has its initial coloured. The word at the start of the sentence is ignored, and a nearby word is highlighted.

The infilling of the capitals was not a superior method of decoration¹¹. It would take little in the way of time and resources to effect. The purpose was more to highlight than to impress. However, the crude nature of the execution, and the mistakes made in the process, show once again the lower quality of the manuscript.

Script

Type and Date of Script

The majority of the quires containing Latin texts, including those containing *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, are written in an Anglicana script, identified more specifically as a Bastard Anglicana script of medium grade, semi-current in presentation¹². The most distinctive feature of the script is the closed s symbol, the same as the Greek sigma¹³. Although by no means ubiquitous, this symbol is usually used in the final position, with the Gothic s

¹⁰*Gesta Karoli Magni* does not have the blue infills. Red is used exclusively for this purpose.

¹¹As opposed to illumination or decorated capitals.

¹²Brown, *op. cit.* pp.100-101. Provides a plate of the script and a description.

¹³*id.*, p.100.

being employed in non-final position. Double s is usually shown by two long minims merging at the head. Other interesting features of the script generally involve the loops attached to the minims of lower case a, b, d, g, h, l¹⁴. This is a regular feature of Anglicana scripts, which are all fully cursive in character.

The Bastard Anglicana script is a cross between Anglicana and Rotunda scripts that was very widely used in England during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries for low and medium grade books¹⁵. This description is totally compatible with the previous observations on the quality of MS. 667, and does not rule out the dating of the manuscript to the mid-fifteenth century. Indeed, allowing for a possible time-delay in the adoption of this script in the Irish scriptoria¹⁶, this script still permits the fifteenth century to be considered as a very likely time the relevant quires of MS. 667 to have been written. For if the final date of the chronicle in the manuscript had been in the early fourteenth century, it would have been difficult to assign the manuscript definitely to that period, as the Bastard Anglicana script was only starting to be employed in England at that time. However, the final date of the chronicle in the manuscript is 1455, and the Bastard Anglicana script does not contradict this date.

Date of Abbreviations

A way of illustrating that the texts can not have been written any earlier than the fifteenth century is by looking for any abbreviations which were not in use prior to this date. By checking the earliest recorded date of usage for a particular abbreviation taken from *Gesta Karoli Magni* and other texts¹⁷, a terminus post-quem of the

¹⁴ibid.

¹⁵ibid.

¹⁶id., p.80. Notes that the Anglicana scripts developed in England from the twelfth century. Although spreading to the continent in the thirteenth century, insular developments in these scripts also started in England.

¹⁷A.Cappelli, *Dizionario de Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane*, Milan, 1912, lists all the abbreviations and their earliest recorded usages.

fifteenth century can be established. Many of the abbreviations used are standard, dating from the earlier part of the Middle Ages. Other abbreviations are characteristic of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. However, none of the abbreviations are of sixteenth-century date. These dates indicate that the texts like *Gesta Karoli Magni* were written at some stage during the fifteenth century. Hence the date given in the chronicle is shown to be a possible date for the writing of the manuscript.

Below are the abbreviations which had their earliest recorded usage in the fifteenth century that are used in one half-column of the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni*, chosen at random (Page 91, col. 1, l.1-25)¹⁸.

abhoi [—] abile	abhominabile
absq ³	absque
g ^w vem	gravem
huilit ⁹	humiliter
oms [—]	omnes
tuc [—]	tunc
vi ⁱ tute	virtute
x ⁱ	Christi
x ⁱ ane	Christiane
xpo [—]	Christo

¹⁸All abbreviations of this column considered with reference to the dates provided by Cappelli, *op. cit.*. Although these abbreviations have been taken from *Gesta Karoli Magni*, they are entirely typical of the quires containing *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* as well.

Résumé

These observations on the codex and script of MS. 667 lead to the same conclusions established by previous scholarship. It is a manuscript datable to the fifteenth century which was compiled out of a number of quires containing Latin texts useful for the Franciscans. It is not a manuscript of high quality, but has the function of a compendium of information. The script of the majority of the quires, identified more specifically as Bastard Anglicana, has proved the most useful item to categorise the manuscript with respect to quality and date. From these general observations, it will now be possible to study the unusual characteristics of the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* in greater detail.

SECTION THREE**THE QUIRE CONTAINING *GESTA KAROLI MAGNI*****Physical Characteristics of the Quire**

The text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* is contained on the quire of the manuscript which is called quire vi⁸ in Colker's catalogue¹. Hence it is the sixth quire of the manuscript and it contains eight folios, a total of sixteen pages, which are numbered from 85 to 100². It is sandwiched between two quires, the first of which contains a copy of *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* and the second of which contains the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*³. Like these neighbouring quires, the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* is written in Bastard Anglicana script. However the scribe of this quire did not write the neighbouring quires. The minims are shorter, and the script presents a less 'spiky' appearance⁴. This is not the only difference between this quire and the majority of the others. In the process of codicological examination, observations concerning the quality of the vellum, the ruling of the pages, and the fading of the text in certain key places, hinted at this quire being somewhat unusual in MS. 667.

Vellum

The quire, particularly the outer folios, is made of a vellum which appears to be of a somewhat finer quality than the other Latin quires. The two outer folios are considerably smoother to the touch, a lighter colour and much less speckled in appearance. These characteristics are noticeable to a lesser extent on the inner folios of the quire. In addition, the outer folio is very thin compared to the rest of the quire,

¹M. Colker, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts in the Library of T.C.D.*, vol.2, Scholar Press, Aldershot, 1991, p.1132.

²Manuscript pagination added at a date after the final compilation.

³Colker, *op. cit.*, pp. 1102/7/9 describes these three named texts in the manuscript.

⁴This and all succeeding observations were made by inspection.

and certainly much thinner than the neighbouring folios of the previous and succeeding quires.

Consequently, although it is similar, the vellum does not appear to have been produced in quite the same milieu as the vellum which was used for the majority of the other Latin quires of the manuscript. This implies that the quire was produced independently of the neighbouring quires, which in turn suggests that the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* was an item included in MS. 667 when binding was taking place.

Page Ruling

The layout of the text on the page of the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* is also similar to that of the rest of the manuscript, but it is not identical. Most importantly, the measurements of ruling are different from those of the neighbouring quires. In the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni*, the columns have been ruled with the dimensions of 17.5 x 5.3 cm, with 0.5 cm between each ruled line, and 0.4 cm between the adjacent margins of the two columns. There are 2.9 cm between the base of the column and the bottom of the page.

Throughout the other Latin quires of the manuscript, there is little variation on the standard figures given earlier for the ruling of the columns⁵. The differences in the measurements of this one quire imply that the pages were ruled independently using a different standard set of measurements to those used by all the other Latin quires.

⁵See previous section.

Fading

Although much of the text is legible, in the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* the text of the columns nearest the exposed edge is often faded, at times to the point of illegibility. This fading is particularly apparent on the first and last pages, where in addition the edges of the columns nearest the binding are also unclear.

This fading of the first and last pages of the quire imply that these pages have suffered more from exposure than the interior pages of the quire. The outside pages of quires v. and vii. do not display nearly the same degree of fading on any edge. Thus quire vi. appears to have been stored in a different place from the other quires prior to binding that could have permitted a more prolonged attack from the elements, which would naturally affect the outside pages in particular.

Summary

Although the general appearance of quire vi of MS. 667 is very similar to the other Latin quires, the observations concerning the quality of the vellum, the ruling and the fading imply that this quire was written independently of the other Latin quires, the majority of which are more alike each other than quire vi. The vellum is part of a different batch, seemingly of a higher quality, and looks like a slight misfit within the rest of the vellum of the manuscript. The different ruling measurements support this view and imply the preparation of the written pages in quire vi. also occurred independently from the other quires. It may be asked why these observations were not discussed by any earlier scholar. It would seem that a quick examination of the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* as given by Esposito⁶ or Colker⁷ was not adequate, as

⁶M. Esposito, 'Une Version Latine du Roman de "Fierabras"' in *Romania* 62, 1936, pp.534-41.

⁷Colker, *op. cit.*, pp.1091-333.

the immediate appearance of the quire is little different to that of the surrounding quires. The observations were only noticed after a more detailed codicological survey.

History of the Quire

At this stage, it can be asked how the observations made above can help determine the history of the quire of MS. 667 in which *Gesta Karoli Magni* is contained. Having established the independence of the quire, and having noted the distinguishing features, it must now be asked if the quire was originally part of a manuscript containing the complete *Gesta Karoli Magni*. If so, how, and when did this individual quire come to be incorporated in MS. 667?

The independent origin of this quire is important for explaining why the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* is only half extant. The extant portion of *Gesta Karoli Magni* breaks off in mid-sentence at a point very close to the mid-point of the narrative. It may be inferred that this copy of *Gesta Karoli Magni* was originally complete and written on two very similar quires. These quires would have been written around the same time as the other quires written in Bastard Anglicana script in MS. 667.

During the course of time, the two quires on which the *Gesta Karoli Magni* was written became detached, and the second quire was subsequently lost. The surviving quire was stored, with the outer pages becoming somewhat faded due to exposure. The quire was then included in MS. 667 which was being, or had been, compiled out of a number of quires from the library of Ennis or Quin. After the subject matter of the text had been noticed, the remaining quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* was included to form an interesting addition to the manuscript, where the story could be read in conjunction with *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*.

In Irish translation, *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* had come to form a preface to *Sdair Fortibrais*⁸. The *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* became an epilogue to the Fierabras texts in the Franco-Burgundian tradition, best represented by the text of Jehan Bagnyon. If the compiler was following the pattern of texts established at the time of Bagnyon, which is also well represented in the Irish tradition in manuscripts such as Egerton 1781⁹, a date in the last quarter of the fifteenth century would be implied for the inclusion of this quire into the manuscript¹⁰.

There are a number of potential problems with this model for the history of the quire. In the first instance, it could be inferred that the scribe was copying the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and ran out of space on which to write, and so made it look as if one half had gone missing. But this would seem less plausible, considering that the text breaks off at the end of the quire at a point so close to the middle of the text.

The second problem concerns the date of writing of the quire. The manuscript has been dated to around 1455, and the previous list of abbreviations from *Gesta Karoli Magni* indicate a fifteenth-century date for the quire. But if this quire were originally part of a different manuscript, then it could have been written either earlier or later in the fifteenth century than the quire containing the chronicle. It can not be concluded that the quire is necessarily older than the rest of MS. 667, as it may have been added into the manuscript at any time after the initial compilation of the manuscript. It is tempting to infer from the fading that it is older than the rest of the manuscript, but the fading may be a result of mistreatment of the quire at any time prior to its incorporation into the codex. However, with the evidence that has been available so far, it is not possible to conclude anything more about the date of the quire, beyond its

⁸True in all extant manuscripts.

⁹R. Flower, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol.2, London, 1926, p.526-7.

¹⁰Of course, the juxtaposition of the Fierabras story and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* is also found in the compilation of David Aubert, dated 1458. However, there is no real evidence to suggest that this work ever directly influenced Ireland. The same is not true of the work of Bagnyon, following the printing of an English translation of the text by Caxton.

ascription to the fifteenth century. Therefore a description of its provenance, like the description above, which omits reference to an exact date is suitable.

A third problem concerns the compilation of the manuscript itself. It is not clear if the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni* was stitched into an already bound manuscript, or if the manuscript was being compiled at this time from a number of loose quires. Some of these quires, including the quire of *Gesta Karoli Magni* and the quires containing material in Irish, were written independently from, and possibly at a different time to, the majority of the quires which have a more uniform appearance, which would imply that these independent quires were inserted into an earlier compilation. However, if the manuscript was compiled, or re-compiled, in the late fifteenth century from loose quires, it would be easy to comprehend how quires containing *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* came to be adjacent to each other. It would be a remarkable coincidence if two of these texts happened to be in the right order on two neighbouring quires just ready for the third to be inserted.

Résumé

None of the problems listed above would seriously affect the fundamental conclusions about the quire containing *Gesta Karoli Magni*, or indeed about MS. 667 itself. The quire was written at some stage in the fifteenth century, and was then incorporated later on in the century into a compilation of material of interest to the Franciscans, in such a way that the quire could be sandwiched between quires containing *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*. These basic ideas are not undermined.

GESTA KAROLI MAGNI COMMENTS ON THE MANUSCRIPT TEXT

The text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* is written on one quire containing sixteen pages of MS. 667. On the page, the text is written in double columns which are line-ruled and margined. All the columns are forty-nine lines long, with the exception of page 87, of which the columns have forty-eight lines.

The text is written in Bastard Anglicana Script by a scribe who wrote using a brown ink of medium shade. This colour is constant through the text. Blue ink has been used occasionally to touch up certain words or phrases, presumably due to their becoming unclear at an early date. However, there is no evidence to suggest when this activity might have taken place.

The text as extant is generally legible. However, there are certain places, particularly on page 85 and 100, where the ink has faded, rendering an accurate reading impossible. Some of the unclear or illegible words are restorable by reference not only to the visible letters but also to *Sdair Fortibrais* and the *Chanson de Fierabras*.

There is a very high average number of words on each page. As well as the large number of lines, the density of word number per line has been increased by the considerable use of abbreviations. Suspension marks are used to indicate most nasal consonants and longer words containing these nasals. Contractions are frequently used to represent syllables containing certain common digraphs. Simple pronouns and parts of the relative and demonstrative pronouns are usually shown by means of a contraction. Tironian notae are also used to represent some basic syllables such as 'et' and 'con-'. In the text, the abbreviations have occasionally been omitted, necessitating the addition of letters to the edition of the text.

One further way the scribe was able to increase the density of words was by the use of shortened spelling forms. The most common example is the omission of the '-a-' in the feminine noun/pronoun ending '-ae'. Another potential example is the replacing of a double letter by a single, most notably 'equus' being written 'equs', although it could be argued that this is a scribal error.

The spelling of the words by the scribe is for the most part accurate. However, there are some mistakes, a number of which involve the substitution of a broad vowel for a slender one if the vowel in the preceding consonant is also broad, following the Irish spelling rule. This would imply that the scribe (or a predecessor) was pronouncing the Latin words using an Irish pronunciation.

Another mistake sometimes found is the copying of extra letters. Some of these mistakes were corrected by the scribe, or a reader of the manuscript, either using punctum delens or a red line for deletion. A number of unnecessary letters have gone unnoticed, requiring the deletion of such letters from the edited text.

The scribe himself employed the caret mark to show an insertion, written either interlinearly or in the margin. Highlighters of the text have also added comments in the margins of the text, indicating the place to which the comment refers by means of red, or in one instance pink, crosses. As with the use of blue ink, there is no evidence to suggest who was using these different coloured inks, or when the activity was occurring.

The scribe employed a rather crude punctuation system, with points being added to divisions between sentences and clauses. However, their use is far from accurate. A number of clauses are bisected incorrectly by an errant point. Red oblique strokes also

separate a number of the sentences and clauses, but likewise their use is not totally accurate.

Capital letters were employed to show words at the start of a sentence. Again their use is not accurate, with the incorrect word, for example at the start of a subordinate clause, being given a capital letter. Capitals were also used for personal names, but not for placenames. A number of the capitals were highlighted by means of red ink infils. These red infils are the only obvious decorative elements in the text.

1. The edition represents the text of *Gesta Karoli Magni* as it is written in T.C.D. MS. 667. Each line of each column is represented by a corresponding line in the edition.
2. Words have been edited with all the abbreviations expanded. Where a letter, syllable or word is represented by an abbreviation in the manuscript, it is written in italics in the edition.
3. Letters added during the editorial process are shown surrounded by square brackets.
4. Letters in the manuscript which are unnecessary are surrounded by rounded brackets.
5. Words that are erroneously spelt in the manuscript are corrected in the edition, the corrected letter(s) being surrounded by parentheses.
6. Letters in the manuscript which are unclear or illegible are shown surrounded by angled brackets. If the letters can be reconstructed, they are written between the angled brackets. If not, points show approximately the number of unreadable letters.
7. A modern punctuation system has been imposed on the edition.
8. Letters and symbols highlighted with red ink in the manuscript are shown in outline form in the edition, e.g. *À*, /, *mm*, + .

9. The one symbol in pink ink is shown in shadow form, †.
10. Letters or words in the manuscript deleted by punctum delens are shown in the edition with each letter followed by a bold asterisk, i.e. *.
11. Letters in the manuscript deleted by a red line are shown in the edition with an outlined dash between each letter, i.e. -.
12. Words in the manuscript which are highlighted in blue ink are underlined in the edition.
13. Words inserted over a caret mark, or in the margins are shown thus in the edition. Likewise, letters or words written in superscript in the manuscript are edited in superscript.
14. Any column headings are shown in the identical place. Columns are headed with the page number corresponding to numbers in MS. 667. The column number has been added to the edition.
15. Paragraph numbers follow those of Stokes's edition of *Sdair Fortibrais*.

Page 85, column 1. *Hic Incipiunt gesta Karoli Magni et cetera.*

[§1] Sicut apud *Sanctum Dyonisium* inter
cetera gesta in scriptis reperitur. Post
obdormitionem in domino bone memorie venerabilis
Helene m[at]ris Constantini imperatoris quae cruc{e}m
domini nostri Ihesu Christi cum corona ceterisque reliquiis sanctorum
tanquam pia sancte ecclesie filia Ierosolimis deportavit 5
 <a> Iude[i]s cruce divisa per partes et ad diversa loca
 <sancta> per pia[m] devotionem beate ecclesie oblatas, tan-
 dem corona cum clavis ceterisque reliquiis ponti-
 fici <Roma>no Rome erant oblatae. [§2] Regnante 10
 <ver>o Karolo nobili imperatore in Francia pro rege
 venit unus Admirandus qui super omnes paga-
 nos principatum optinuit. Habens filium nomine
 Fortibras cui in decore nec valore vix aliquis
 valuit assimilari. Erat enim probitatis in multis 15
 <de>ligantis <.....>. Lo[n]gitududo vero ipsius erat
 quindecim pedum. Erat utique tante probitatis
 quod in omni loco bellandi, triumphavit. Et adhuc
 habuit unam sororem legitimam nomine Floripes
 mulieres totius regni decore prae cellens. Allu- 20
 do seu candor ni{v}is carnem eius non prae fulsit.
 Admirandus autem furians nitebatur totum Christian(i)orum
 destruere una cum filio Fortibras non cessans
 er<ec>t<oo>s prostern[er]e et sanctos per diversa loca martyrisare.
 Tandem Romam veniens, papam nomine Iohannem 25

occidit. *Monachos seu quoscumque sanctos gladiavit.*

Civitate itaque devicta coronam Ihesu cum

uteris reliquiis usque ad turrim de Egrimor secum

iussit deportari. / [§3] Karolus autem imperator vo-

lens de manibus barbarorum reliquias eripere

30

congregavit exercitum suum cum suis xii. paribus

et viriliter procedens et regnum Francie pertransi-

ens fixit tentoria sua distantia per xii

dietas ab Egrimor. [§4] Fortibras vero

ex audito intelligens regem Karolum ve[n]-

35

turum congregavit sibi quinquaginta milia ar-

matorum et disposuit ut quadraginta mi-

lia committ(o)ere[n]t bellum contra Christianos et quod decem

milia laterent inter fruticas donec bannum

suum audirent volens furtive facere

40

irruptionem contra Karolum. Tamen confidens

in virtute sua[e] fortitudinis venit armatus

ad trabem Karoli quae pro ligno fuit fixa.

Ad exercit<ium> gestavit clipeum in collo et

hastam <in> <manu>. Sedens autem super dextrarium

45

suum vo<c>ifer<ate> sic clamavit "Tu rex

Karole cum florida barba, veni et

ostende virtute[m] tua<m> <in> dimicando mecum si au-

{d}es. Si timor te invasit mitte Rolandum

vel Oliverum vel quemcumque nobilem. Et si timeat solum cum solo proeliari veniant duo.

Et si ^{iiii^{or}} vel v contra me veniunt ad proeliandum eos non timebo. Et si non feceris, veniam(que)

cum valida ^{et} te premam nobiles vero mili-

et multitudine 5

tes tuos interficiam et regnum tuum ex toto destruiam." [§5] Interim autem, pagani graviter

irruerunt in Christianos committentes dirum bellum. Et nisi Karolus supervenisset in auxilium,

Rolandus cum xii paribus fuissent devicti 10

et barbari potiti victorias. In quo conflictu

Oliverus graviter est plagatus, multis paganis interfectis. [§6] Hiis peractis remeavit

ad sua tentoria cum exercitu. Dominus

Karolus iubet mensas apponi ad cibandum.

15

Et cum mero cepit exilarari prorupit in verba iactantie "Milites senes plus

valuerunt in proelio quam iuniores". Unde Rolandus

m[u]ltum indignatus una cum ceteris militibus

iunioribus. [§7] Postera vero die, cum rex Karo-

20

lus se paravit ad cibandum, ecce Forti-

bras iterum clamavit dicens "O tu Ka-

role iam video te perterritum ex quo non venis

nec mittis aliquem contra me prout <ro>gavi. Iuro

pro deum meum quod despererem eorum sanguinem

25

tanquam aquam si venirent. Ego autem super Christi
 reges triumphavi in campo solus. Non <quaequam>
 ter(i)et dies quin ocidam aliquanda Christianiis
 nisi faveris petitioni mee. [§8] Rex autem Karo-
 lus hec audiens, Ricardum comitem 30
 Normannie quaerens ab eo si habet aliquam
 notitiam de eo, quia multas terras et diversas
 comes ille peregrinaverat. Respondens comes ei
 "Domine sciat is pro certo quod non est per multa me[a]
 aliquis maioris probitatis seu fortitudinis. 35
 Est vero Rex Alexandrie. Quinque enim magn{i} sunt
 subiect{i} sibi. Iste Romam invasit. Pa<pa>
 cum multis Christianis pereunt. Coronam Ihesu
 cum reliquiis sanctorum secum deportavit. Non
 est qui sibi in bello valet resistere." [§9] Impera- 40
 tor ad hec dixit "Cibum non gustabo donec
 habeat aliquem pugnaturum". Et advocans
 ad se Rolandum dixit "Praepara te ad e<l>-
 landum cum isto pagano ". [§10] Et Rolandus
 multa indignans respondit "Per <.....> <.....> istum 45
 ad<versariu>[m] mallet <.....> <.....>
 fore <.....>. Cu[m] <.....> <.....> <.....>
 esses <....> <...> d<ix>isti <quod> <milites>
 senes praevaluerunt in bello quam iuvenale[s],

*cum tuus miles iuvenis Oliverus sit graviter
 vulneratus nullus vero senior aliquam molestiam
 habuit. mitte ergo de senioribus tuis
 contra paganum qui defendat regnum tuum et
 honorem. Promitto pro certo quod si quis de soda- 5
 libus meis de illo bello se intromiserit,
 in posterum erit mihi ut inimicus. Nunc invetera-
 te defendas regnum Francie et tuum ho-
 norem." [§11] Imperator autem anxius tenens ciro-
 tecam et percussit cum ea Rolandum in denti- 10
 bus, ita quod sanguis emanavit. Rolan-
 dus sanguinem videns ignescit. Et extrahens
 gladium se parat regem percutere. Sed praepe-
 ditus est per astantes. Rex admodum
 fur^Λiens iussit astantes illum capere et 15
 ligare, iurans per Sanctum Dionysium quod
 viliter moreretur. Rolandus stans tanquam
 aper atratus inhiuit ne quis sibi manus ini-
 ceret dicens si quis hoc attemptaret
 moreretur. [§12] Imperator vero ultramodum 20
 accensus ait circumstantibus "Vidistis
 unquam maiorem ingratitudinem quam qui iure
 naturali sa[n]ctum carnem et sanguinem te-
 netur me defensare cum nititur peri-
 mere?" Dux vero Ogerus inter verba dul- 25*

cia dicit Rolando "Minus reverenter locu-
 tus es domino imperatori." Cui Rolandus
 "Mirum non est si insanio." [§13] Dux vero Reimerus
 mollibus verbis regem de<pl>acens ait
 "Domine imperator, ista omittantur et provide- 30
 at tua providentia, de aliquo qui contra paganum
 valeat bellum committere." Interim intravit
 unus ad Oliverum in lecto iacentem ob
 plagarum grave[tu]dinem et narravit quomodo
 paganus ille provocavit regem ad bel- 35
 landum et totam distantiam inter regem
 et Rolandum et quod nullus militum se optu-
 lit ad bellandum. [§14] Tunc utique Oliverus
 anxius velocius surrexit iubens astan-
 tibus sua ligare vulnera cum blig<....> 40
 de serico. Plagis ligatis dicit Garino
 astanti "Ego vado dimitandum contra
 illum barbarum." Cui Garinus "Domine vis
 tu gratis perire? Satis notum est omnibus quod si de
 proelio te intromiseris, nunquam redibis cum vita. 45
 Nolit deus te disponere tanto discrimi-
 ni seu periculo." [§15] Cui Oliverus "Nemo va-
 loris desistere debet a laude propria ampli-
 and{a} nec pro honore imperatoris Karoli

augmentando. Si vero nunc sibi deficio, quomodo
 in me in posterum *con* fidebit? In urgenti
 negotio, fidelis amicus *compro* batur. Liga mea
 vulnera et deferas *confestim* arma mea
 et ne moreris." Garinus resistere non au- 5
 dens *protulit* arma *quibus* *decenter* ar-
 matus. Accinxit se gladio vocabulo
 Hauteclere, ascendens *dextrarium*
 Ferrant de Hyspania et *prae* agilitate
 non tangens <...>ona selle dehinc pen- 10
 debat ad collum clipeum *decenter* de-
 coratum. [§16] Cingens se zona aurea signo
 crucis se muniendo ut miles *inclitus*
 absque pavore *astringens* lanceam pugno,
 dextrario sub{ivi}t calcaria ad *praesentiamque* 15
 Karoli festinans. Cum *autem* in *praesentia* Karo-
 li *ceterorumque* nobilium xii *parium* pervenit,
 Salutato venerabili imperatore dicit
 regi mansuete "Domine imperator rogo
 quod non sis *tediatus* de *sermonibus* meis. 20
 Satis novit tua discretio, quod ex quo exstiti
 asociatus Rolando nepoti tuo nullum sti-
 pendium recepi, cum tamen sepius periculo mortis
 me disposui ad honorem tuum *magnifican-*
 dum. Nunc tibi devote supplico ut aliquod 25

stipendium mihi rependatis." Cui imperator "*Satis*
scio. Sustine donec fuerimus in Francia reversi et
ibidem satisfaciam tibi ad placitum tue volun-
tatis, et te ditabo castris villis et magnarum
amplitudine terrarum." [§17] Cui Oliverus "*Domine* 30
taliam non peto. Sed rogo ut mihi concedas
cum pagano illo proeliare. Et pro omni meo servitio
ultra hoc non posco." Omnes vero astantes
et admirantes cum murmure dixerunt "Rem stultam
petit iste. Bene scimus si bellum cum pagano 35
commiserit, peribit cum sit graviter plagatus et
magno roris fluxu debilitatus." [§18] Imperator
autem sibi compatiendo ait "Amice Olivere, vade
et quiescas in lecto tuo. Absit quod tu committeres
bellum cum sis graviter cruentatus. Bene tibi non ace- 40
do propter grave periculum et eminens dedecus et iactamen
quae per hoc possent evenire." [§19] Rolandus hoc videns
graviter contristatur eo quod minus reverenter in
avunculum suum irruerat et libenter bellum
commisisset, nisi Oliverus praevenisset. Ad hoc 45
surrexerunt duo proditores vocabulo
Gindeleon et Herdre, qui ut potuerunt ni-
tebantur prodere xii pares Francie et dixerunt
imperatori "Domine in Francia statuisti pro lege

si duo de paribus decreverint facturum ali-
 quod et super hoc mutuū habuerint consensum,
 illud pro rato haberetur et firmo. Ecce nos
 ad tuum statutum affirmandum adiudi-
 camus Oliverum proeliari cum pagano, 5
 ex quo se offert mera voluntate
 sive cuiuscumque rogatu. [§20] Imperator autem agno-
 scens illorum maliciam, Respondit impatienter
 "O pro ditores infortunium vos invadit.
 Iuro per Sanctum Dyonisium si ipse periclitaverit 10
 destruetur tota vestra progenies et am-
 bo vos moriemini morte vilissima propter
 verba vestra. Eum nunc licentio ut proelietur. Vadet
 in Christi nomine." Gindeleon autem susurru veredixit ad
 Herdre / "Nunquam redeat vita comiti." Impera- 15
 tor vero in signum licetie cirotecam suam Olivero commen-
 davit. [§21] Reynerus utique dux de Geniove
 pater Oliveri haec prospiciens amaro corde ad pedes
 regis se inclinavit dicens "Domine mis(er)ere mihi,
 habens pietatem de filio meo. Bene no[vi]sti ipsum 20
 graviter fore plagatum. Quomodo valet bellare cum
 tot plagarum gravidine et tanti cruoris effusione
 gravatus? Domine discretio tua videat stulticiam
 suam." Cui imperator "Ex quo cirotecam meam re-
 cepit, licentia nequit revocari." [§22] Oliverus vero 25

convertens se ad duces et barones assisten-
tes, humiliter petivit veniam si in aliquo verbo
vel facto prae buerat eis offensam. Unde omne s
gem entes deum rogant ut prospere posset re-
dire cum honore. Oliverus itaque benedictione 30
Karoli recepta et hasta sua assumpta
ut miles imperterritus egreditur usque veniens ad
(ad) collem. Quo ascenso suaviter equitavit
donec venit ad locum ubi Fortibras paganus
inermis quievit sub arbore. Qui videns 35
Oliverum indignanter contempsit surgere pro eo
dedignans. [§23] Cui Oliverus "A diuro te Sarra-
cene ut dicas mihi quis es et unde et quod est nomen
tuum." [§24] Sarracenus ad eum "Vocor Fortibras
qui rex sum Alexandrie habens sub me quinque reges 40
exceptis ceterisque magnitatibus ut opinor
non est sub firmamento ultra me ditatus. Ro-
mam destruxi papam cum multis Christianis
necavi. Coronam Christi vestri cum ceteris sanctorum
reliquiis asportavi. Civitatem quoque Ierosolim cum 45
sepulchro in quo deus vester iacuit mihi subiugavi.
Et quis est qui mihi resistet?" [§25] Cui Oliverus "Hec est
iactantia meroris non valoris ex quo

creatorem tuum vilipendisti. Surge propere, arma te quia facinus quod Christo in<f>ecisti in te vindicabo, et nisi citius te armaveris, ista lancea te perforabo." [§26] ¶ Fortibras vero hoc audiens subrisit et dixit "Rogo ut dicas mihi nomen et prog(r)eniam." Cui Oliverus "Ante solis occasum scies nomen meum. Dominus Karolus per me misit ut tu deseras ritum tuum et baptizeris et credas in Ihesum Christum, et quod coronam cum ceteris reliquiis sibi reddas. Sin autem ducam te ad eum fortiter ligatum et tanquam furem viliter tractatum qui te mansipabit dire morti ad suum beneplacitum. Ideo festinanter praepara te ad proeliandum." [§27] Cui Fortibras "Pro certo tibi dico, si videas me armatum, audacia tua in formidinem vertetur et pavorem." In posterum addidit "Qualis est iste Karolus et Rolandus eius nepos, Oliverus, Ogerus Le Deneuis et ceteri(s) de quibus sit tantus sermo in populo?" [§28] Cui Oliverus "Te certifico quod in terris non est similis Karolo in probitate seu valore. Rolandus autem miles pervalidus in omni bello et triumphans. Oliverus est compositus miles ad effigiem meam. Ogerus vero est inclitus miles satis expertus in proeliis et probatus." [§29] Et Fortibras ait "Quare ergo nullus eorum est missus mecum

proeliari?" Cui Oliverus "*Quia dedignantes te contempnunt.*" [§30] Cui Fortibras "*Rogo vero, dicas mihi nomen tuum et tuam progeniem.*" Cui Oliverus "*Garinus vocor, de Perigos, filius unius vassoris qui appellatur Iacereth. Rex autem Karolus nuper me creavit in militem et misit me tecum dimicare. Bene armes te celeriter vel militia(m) mea(m) cum lancea te perfodiam.*"

30

[§31] Hoc audito Fortibras sine signo impatientie vel ire levavit caput et super clipeum appodiavit et dixit

35

"*Nunquam consuevi pugnare cum tam exili vassallo et nisi verteretur in dedecus amputare mihi caput tuum in instanti. Consuevi itaque certare cum regibus et ducibus et nobilibus terrarum et non cum tam vassallo.*" Cui Oliverus "*Ego te certifico quod diem*

40

ulterius [non] morer quin te perfodiam nisi celerius te prae pares." [§32] Cui Fortibras "*Animadverto tuam animositatem et tuam voluntatem proeliandi. Iam tibi facio servilitatem quod nemini optuli hic usque. Ego*

vero dextrarium meum ascendam et cum me <o>curr<es> *cum lancea, gratis cadam de equo quem tecum adduces dicens quod me prostrasti.*" [§33] Cui Oliverus

45

"*Velis nolis, equum ducam cum capite tuo.*"

Cui Fortibras "Nichil vituperabile in te video
 non s{ed} pugna<r>e <v>{olo} cum tam exili persona, ne impu-
 taretur pro obprobrio. Rogo pro militia tua quod fac-
 ias votum meum vel quae ras Rolandum vel
 Oliverum vel Ogerum vel aliquem nobilem 5
 ne nobilitas mea vilificetur. Vel veniant
 contra me duo vel tres de validioribus, quia ho-
 norificum est certare cum talibus." Cui Oliverus
 "Ante solis occasum arrogantiam tue iactantie
 humiliabo. Adhuc dico te prae pares antequam te 10
 perforem." [§34] Ad hoc Fortibras elevans caput,
 respexit et vidit sanguinem Oliveri defluentem
 in terram et dixit "Vassale video te plagatum
 esse. Unde defluit ille sanguis?" Cui Oliverus
 "Ego pupugi impetuose caballum. Unde sanguis 15
 emanat." [§35] // Fortibras respondit "Ego certus sum
 quod sanguis defluit sub tua lorica. Habeo vero
 mecum duos barellos parvulos plenos bal-
 samo pretioso quo ungebatur Christus in sepulchro
 positus, quos adquisivi mihi quando Romam destruxi. Unde 20
 si quis modicum quid gustaverit, ab omni plaga seu
 infirmitate salvabitur. Ecce cape et gusta,
 ut cum sanus fueris, audacius pugnes et for-
 tius et mihi sit honorabilis." [§36] Cui Oliverus "Non
 gustabo donec lucrer illos per bellum. Omitte 25

arrogantiam tuam in loquendo et veni ut ostendas verba tua in facto." [§37] Tunc Fortibras surrexit et se evexit et longitudo illius protendebat ad quindecim pedes et dixit "Garinne compatiore tibi adhuc. Rogo quod facias prout dixi et assumas equum et producas aliquem nobilem validum mecum dimicaturum, vel bibas de balsamo ad tuam salutem vel valorem et honorem meum."

30

Fortibras autem certus quod Oliverus in nullo adquiesceret sibi. Rogavit eum humiliter ut auxiliaretur ad armandum eum. Cui Oliverus "Fortibras in tempus {m}e confidas ut per me velis armari?"

35

Et Fortibras "Satis novi per indicium et modum gerendi, quod huc usque non eras proditor sed odiens proditorem. Et [n]unquam vero proditor fui, sed proditores semper odio habui." [§38] † "Garinne multa tibi negotiorum quia sentio et scio me non per multa tempora me ligasse armatum." [§39] Fortibras autem ostendens sibi tres mucrones dicit "Ecce tres isti gladii

40

apparati. Unus nominatur Plorante. Secundus nominatur Bapteym. Tertius Graban. Raro in terris meliores reperientur. Tres vero germani fabri ferarii fuerunt, vocabolo Goliards, Munificas, Agrifax. In terris subtiliores non fuerunt.

45

† Tunc Oliverus ipsum armavit modo meliori quo opinione scivit. Quod videns Fortibras et sentiens ait

Golians fabricavit Hautecler, Joyus,
 Fortbrige. Munificans fabricavit Du-
 rindal, Sanguine, Curtem. Arifaxat fabri-
 cavit Bapteyme, Plorans, Graban.

Istos tres semper mecum produco. Duo vero

5

pendent ad sellam, tertio sum accinctus ad
 bellandum." Hiis dictis dextrarium suum ascen-
 dit qui consuevit ferociter strangulare,
 quos dominus suus FFortibras in bello prostraue-

r{a}(n)t. Accipiens quoque barellos cum balsa-

10

mo ^{cos} ad sellam secure pendebat. Pen-

dens ext<ra> clipeum deauratum ad collum,

assumpsit lanceam [et] fortiter vibrans eam dicit

"Garinne adhuc rogo ut gustes de bal-

samo, q{uia} probitatis non est (et) <d>ecus certare cum

15

uno plagato et fere mortu{o}." Cui Oliverus

"In brevi satis eris expertus me sanum esse

et vivum." [§40] Tunc Fortibras dixit "Garinne contendo

te per illum deum in quem credis et baptismum tuae

salutis quod ostendas mihi nomen tuum." Ad hec

20

Oliverus "Dico tibi certum quod Oliverus vocor, socius

et comes Rolandi." Et FFortibras "Hoc

bene consideravi invidendo gestum tuum.

Adhuc rogo pro deo tuo quod suma<s> aliquid

de balsamo ne mihi imponatur pro brose hominem

25

dimedium interfecisse de perempto." Cui
 Oliverus "Pro toto tuo regno non faciam donec
 triumpho belli balsamum mihi adquiram.
 Adhuc rogo quod convertatis ad Ihesum Christum
 ne confu[n]daris. merito ille confundit, 30
 qui spreto deo suo vivo et vero colit ydola
 vana que nec ipsis auxiliari valent <vires>
 adorantibus." [§41] Cui Fortibras "Absit quod ego
 perderem deum meum Macometum vel nega-
 rem. Adhuc rogo ut gustes de bal- 35
 samo, sive autem recedam." Et Oliverus "Et sequar
 te percutiendo quia velis nolis mecum di-
 micabis." Cui Fortibras "Ex quo ita est
 de cetero te defendas." Mox separatim {et}
 invicem hastas vibraverunt et in primo congressu 40
 in partes minutas illas confregerunt. Unde
 extractis gladiis duos ictus geminaverunt.
 [§42] Karolus vero imperator genuflectens et inter
 duas manus crucem elevans, et pro milite
 suo deum deprecabatur. Cui angelus domini ap- 45
 paruit dicens "Oliverus triumphabit et hoc
 cum magno periculo et gravi labore." [§43] Barones
 vero de Francia bellum respicientes, valde
 timuerunt, divinum implorantes auxilium.

FFortibras *autem* irruens in Oliverum et clipeum suum
 dimediavit ictu solo. Oliverus sibi non compa-
 tiens scutum suum dimisit in duas partes. FFor-
 tibras *autem* accensus percussit Oliverum super
 galeam in summo, Unde oculi Oliveri scintillabant. 5
 Oliverus *autem* ignescens percussit tanto impetu
 quod duo dextrarii titubabant. Tamen dextrarius Forti-
 bras genuflectebat, Unde minabatur ruinam.
 In illo utique congressu Oliverus percussit Fortibras
 et abscidit magnam p<art>em armorum suorum 10
 sub sinistro brachio usque ad carnem <nu>dam
 et ex contactu Oliveri Fortibras se evexit. [§44]
 Et Barones de Francia hoc videntes mutuo
 locuntur "Domine Ihesu, quem accutissimum gla-
 dium possidet iste paganus." Tunc ait Ro- 15
 landus "Utinam nunc occuparem locum Oliveri."
 Imperator hoc audiens dicit Rolando "Tu
 male generatus vilis spurius non audebas
 contra paganum bellum committere. Si vixero vertetur
 in obprobrium tibi et contumeliam." Rolandus humi- 20
 liter respondit "Domine ad placitum tuum sit tuus
 sermo." [§45] FFortibras deinde vibrans ense percussit
 et abscidit p<art>em magnam armorum
 de crure Oliveri inflicto vulnere. Unde sanguis
 violenter emanavit. Tunc Fortibras ait 25

"Nunc vide^o te in proximo victurum. Adhuc rogo
 quod gustes de balsamo." Oliverus multum ta-
 bescens ait "Nunquam gustabo nisi eos adquiram
 triumpho." [§46] Et ait sub silentio "Domine Ihesu
 quam grave mordet gladius eius. Domine Ihesu
 a te procedit omnis victori{a}, praebe mihi tuum
 auxilium." [§47] Fortibras ait "Olivere pro consue-
 tudine habeo tunc in bello expedire, cum vide-
 ro sanguinem meum de corpore meo prosilire."
 In brevi dicit Oliverus "Hoc videbis autem (d)ante
 et tunc apparebit tua expeditio." Deinde
 agressi sunt mutuo dire percutientes. In
 illo conflictu Fortibras plagavit Oliverum
 in pectore, Unde ex fluxu tanti sanguinis de-
 bilitatur et decoloratur. Fortibras siquidem ad
 dominum suum clamavit "O Macomete deus meus
 in quo confido, ut quid sopore deprivas? Ut quid
 subtraxisti virtutem tue potentie quod iste
 tibi adversarius nondum occiditur? [§48] Oliverus in parte
 diffidens oravit corde "Domine Ihesu Christe
 qui pro salute nostra voluisti crucifigi, salva
 me nunc contra adversarium." Hoc dicto resumpsit
 audaciam <....> quam le<o> ravidus in predam
 <.....> in o<ss{e}> dans sibi ictum horribilem

quo ictu *prae*cidit catenulam *per quam* barelli
 cum balsamo pendebant *qui ad solum cade-*
bant. Equus vero Fortibras *prae*(h)onore ictus
 ultra barellos saltans incepit *percurrere.* Sed *per*
*molestiam frenorum retractus est et prae*pedit^{us} a cursu. 5
Et ante quam potuit se *pro*ut voluit *div*ertere,
 Oliverus assumpserat barellos *et in quantum* voluit,
 gustavit. Exhausto vero balsamo, sic factus est
 sanus, ac si malum -u-n-q- nunquam habuisset. [§49] Hoc facto
 proiecit barellos in qu^odam fluvio ne paga- 10
 nus gustaret ut prius fecerat si *con*tingeret
 eum in posterum plagari. Barelli vero illi in vi-
 gilia nativitat^{is} Iohannis Baptiste quolibet anno
 natant ultra aquam, miraculose cum sint ma-
 gni ponderis ex auro et lapidibus pretiosis 15
 et diversis circumornati. Fortibras autem ista
 videns dolens et commotus, ait Olivero "Graviter
 ista lues." [§50] Cui Oliverus "Pro minis non morior.
 Minus enim nunc te timeo quam prius." [§51] Tunc Forti-
 bras fur^giens volens peratritere Oliverum, 20
 et casu percussit equum Oliveri inter aures,
 et cadens sub Olivero mortuus est. Oliverus
 vero tanquam virtuosus miles et agilis celeriter
 surrexit se erige[n]do ad bellandum. Equus
 vero Fortibras qui consuevit strangulare prostra- 25

tos, stetit pacifice ostendans nullum signum
 crudelitatis. [§52] Unde Fortibras ultra modum ad-
 miratur. Barones itaque de Francia cum astantibus
 hoc prospicientes moleste ferentes se prae parant
 ut in Fortibras cum impetu irruant. Sed propter 30
 angelicam assertionem praehibitam, Imperator illos
 impedivit ab irruptione. Oliverus stans in terris
 concussus imploravit <matri>s dei auxilium. Respi-
 ciens Fortibras sedentem in equo animose pro-
 loquitur "O rex Alexandrie pagane considera 35
 ad quod venisti s[e]c[un]dum tuum clamorem. Dixisti
 enim si Karolus vel Rolandus vel qualiscumque
 veniret ad dimitandum contra te ut quatuor
 vel quinque de valoribus ins<tarent> illo<rum> non ti-
 meres. Sed ecce post arrogantiam tue iac- 40
 tantie non extendisti virtutem tue potentie
 seu virtutis in hominem, sed in animal brutum vilem
 caballum. Unde pro venit tue probitatis talis
 exilitas. Ad hoc venisti ut me t[ri]umphares
 non equum. Deus quoque vind[i]cet in te istam 45
 rusticitatem. Potui vero ut satis noscis
 caballum tuum sepius peremisse." [§53] Fortibras
 quasi <isto> confusus humiliter respondit "Olivere ego
 novi quod erravi et pro certo non occidi equum

tuum voluntarie, *sed* a fortuna utique. Si placet
 ascendas equum meum pugnaturus, et ego pedes
 stabo super terram et recompensando. Et
 ait Oliverus "Absit quod ego facerem, nisi lucrer
 turr triumpho." [§ 54] Cui Fortibras "Olivere multum 5
 admiror de meo dextrario. Quotiescumque aliquem
 prostravi, illico ille consuevit strangulare
 et ecce te prostrato, factus est tanquam agnus
 mansuetus." Cui Oliverus "Mansuescit mihi in
 persona creatoris pro cuius fide o{r}are non 10
 desisto." FFortibras itaque descendit virtuo-
 se percutiens Oliverum, ita quod ensis de ma-
 nu(i) sua elapsus est ad solum. Tunc vero Forti-
 bras proloquitur gaudiose "Olivere nonne
 nunc es triumphatus. Ubi est gladius tuae defen- 15
 sionis?" Oliverus volens gladium suum resu-
 mere, mox Fortibras saltans se interpo-
 suit extendens brachium suum ad percutien-
 dum. Oliverus nimio terrore correptus qua[m]
 melius potuit clipeo suo se protexit. 20
 Illo saltu Fortibras a clipeo p<art>{e}m
 magnam abscidit cum qua(n)dam parte(m)
 lorice, sic quod vix evasit quia plagatus
 fuerat vulnere letali. [§ 55] Barones vero
 hoc videntes nimio terrore attemptati sunt 25

irruere in paganus cum praemoniis imperatoris
sum praepediti ex confidentia seu mon[it]is angeli.

Fortibras autem audiens tumultum baro-
num. nec propter hoc desistebat. sed subridens

dicit Olivero "Quare non resumis gladium 30

tuum cum quo necesse est te defendere. Ecce

deus meus Macometus sua potentia com-

plevit meum placitum. Habeo enim sororem

pulchram cuius pulchritudo excellit omnium

regnorum mulieres. Laudo ergo ut deneges 35

baptismum tuum et fidem tuam et credas deo

meo et tibi coniugabo sororem meam cum regno

Francie ceterisque regnis quae subiugabuntur

et regnabis prae ceteris regibus cum honore.

[§56] Hec audiens Oliverus mirabiliter indignatus 40

respondit "Ad quid profers in avia verba tanquam

incensatus? Nunquam deum meum negabo Ihesum

Christum nec benedictam virginem Mariam eius

matrem. nec eius fidem quam praedicando statuit pro qua

paratus sum morte[m] sustinere." [§57] Cui Fortibras "In- 45

pla[ca]to corde nimis intumescis. Ideo tanquam

stultus abnegas honorem quem tibi offero. Tamen

licentiam tibi praebeo, gladium tuum resumere, quia

vir carens armis defensionis equipollet

mulieri et non ultra. [§58] Cui Oliverus "Pro certo oblatio tua
ingens est beneficium et magne curialitatis
indicium. Tamen etsi crederem illo gladio diverse
regna aquirere, no[n] resumerem nisi fuero potitus
triumpho. Nam si te interficerem enso illo quod fiet 5
in brevi ut spe<ro>, redargui possem tanquam
ingratus." [§59] Cui Fortibras "Nimis utique es elatus
corde; ideo confestim peribis." Oliverus itaque nutu
divino prospiciens (b)insani pagani dextrar[i]um
percepit duos gladios ad costam equi pendere 10
qui celeri(u)s i[n]siliens exeruit unum de gla-
diis vocabulo Bapteym miri splendoris
et decoris, quantitas latitudinis pal(id)mam magnam
longitudo ferri octo pedes protendebat. Et ir-
ruens in Fortibras quasi leo in prae dam suam vibravit 15
ensem dicens "O Rex Alexandrie, ecce speculum
tue mortis." Fortibras hoc videns colore
irritatus infremuit dicens "O Bapteym, quam
care huc usque te observavi. Melior te a la-
tere militis nunquam valuit pendere." [§60] Cui 20
Oliverus "Experiar tuum gladium in te et cum fuero
expertus, reddam tibi Bapteym pro gladio meo."
Et confestim procussit paganum sub mamma,
et abscidit arma universa usque ad visionem
carnis nude. Et gladius inde per molestiam pro- 25

siliens *et* ad solum descendens, erat in terra oc-
 cultatus in fund{o} ad dimedium pedem. FFortibras
 vero periculum illum sic habuit brachium ebe(ta)tum
 quod vires non {t}en<u>it ad percussendum. / quod
 percipiens Oliverus ad gladium suum insil[i]ens 30
 celeriter assumpsit. Et illum extendens brachio
 protenso dixit "Hic est finis vite tue. Tamen ex
 quo virtuose gladium meum adquaesivi, tuum
 tibi concedo recompensando." [§61] Cui Fortibras
 "Omnia quippe quae tibi pro tuo comodo obtuli, indignanter 35
 denegasti. Nec ego modicum quid a te percipiam.
 Unde in instanti peribis." [§62] Ex tunc mutuo se
 dederunt, et FFortibras ictu impetuose fecit
 clipeum Oliveri in aera evolare. Et dixit "Ad
 quid proelialis {r}esistere? Ecce imminet aperte termi- 40
 nus tui belli." Oliverus nichil respondens reper-
 cussit sic, quod ex impetu percussure capita
 illorum collidebant et tanquam ignee scintille
 perserunt ex oculis eorum. Quo saltu fforte, abstu-
 lit totum clipeum Oliveri praeter modicum. 45
 [§63] Unde FFortibras ignescens sens<im> ait "Nunquam
 de cetero proelium committes nec gaudebit in posterum
 amicus in te, nec Karolus tuam prosperitatem vide-
 bit, vel Rolandus. Suscipe mortem a dea

fortuna tibi fac(a)tam." Cum vero Fortibras ele-
 vasset brachium suum cum rigore in altum ut
 ictum mortiferum inferret Olivero, Deo
 a[d]iuvantⁿ te Oliverus prospexit et vidit Fortibras
 a sell{a} eius dextro absque ullo armo 5
 nudam carnem. Et confestim vibrans ensem cum
 virtute direxit ictum suum ibidem et absci-
 dit totam costam dextram cum femore. Gla-
 dius itaque descendens gravem plagam intulit
 cruri ita quod massa usque ad ossa abs[c]isa per 10
 pellem pendebat et viscera illius in exitu ap-
 paruerunt. Sanguis vero eius effluxit de vulnere
 miro cursu. Tunc Fortibras cadens in terram
 pie proclamavit "Olive re mi inclite red-
 do me tibi tua probitate devictum. Peto pro 15
 Ihesu Christo pro cuius amore te disposuisti
 tanto discrimini, quod in eius nomine facias
 me baptizari, et pro tua splendida milita-
 ne me interficias. Nonne deo esset abhomina-
 bile et verteretur tibi in dedecus, si me p(l)aganum 20
 perimeres ex quo me devictum humiliter tibi red-
 do et beneficium Christiane fidei devote exigo.
 Si vero convalescere valeam, pro fide Christi fideliter
 certabo, et Karolo imperatori tanquam domino
 meo terreno humiliter ministrabo. Et omnes 25

reliquias quas Rome eripui sibi deliberabo.

Quod lucrum vel quae gloria tibi erit interficere

me iam mortificatum? Parce obsecro mihi

et rogo ut pro tua nobili militia collo-

ces me super equum coram te et educas

30

me ad imperatorem qui faciat me curari si fieri

potest." Et dixit "Olivere rogo ut induaris

ista lorica, nam quinquaginta milia bar-

barorum misi in bosco delit{e}re qui si a ca-

su occurrerint, valebis securius eis resi-

35

stere." [§64] Oliverus itaque hoc audiens motus pie-

tate lacrimatur. FFortibras autem adiecit

"Insuper omnia sumas tecum gladios meos, ut

reor equidem non sunt meliores ipsis.

Oliverus vero posuit <e>um ex transverso super equum

40

ante ipsum, quia sedere nequivit. [§65] Subito vero

ex latibulo> exiit impetuosse Brulandus

de Momira. Barbarus autem percussit Oliverum

in pectore et nisi s[e]c[un]da(m) fuisset lorica letale

vulnus sibi impressisset. [§66] Tunc ait FFortibras

45

"Locetis me in aliquo loco ubi Sarraceni

me non percipiant." Oliverus autem suaviter as-

sumpsit eum de equo et dulciter collocavit

eum in quodam latibulo, Subdens equo calca-

ria sperans prospere adire ad exercitum Karoli pro
 auxilio optinendo. Et ecce X milia Saracenorum
 occurrerunt sibi. Subito ipse vero implorans
 divinam defensionem extraxit Hautecler
 .i. ensem et obvians filio imperatricis pa- 5
 ganorum et dissecuit eum usque ad pectus cuius
 lanceam assumens tanquam leo fur¹iens in<ter>
 barbaros discurrens. Triginta et amplius
 ad Tartara descendere compulsi. In illo
 conflictu peremit illum nobilem barbarum 10
 vocabulo Glaugis. Pagani vero se-
 quebantur eum undique. [§67] Tandem Moradas
 et Turgisins. Sortibant de Co<rnu>bia et
 rex Marganus irruerunt impetuose in
 eum clamantes "A Galice non sic evades." 15
 Quemcumque autem ipse gladio attingebat,
 plagavit letaliter prostravit vero bar-
 baros ut luppus oves sive agnos. Sara-
 ceni vero per infortunium interficiunt ipsius equum.
 Ipse tum erigens se velocius super pedes 20
 assumpsit sibi clipeum viriliter vibrans
 Hautecler, unde vix aliquis appropinquare
 sibi audebat. Tamen sic pagani tot ic-
 tibus ipsum percusserunt quod scutum suum divi-
 debatur i[n] partes permodicas et duabus lo- 25

ricis pluries perforatis. Quatuor vulnera
 gravia, *sed non letalia in corpore suo*
nequiter impresserunt. Et violenter eum rapu-
erunt ligantes eum stricte et cum una
benda oculos suos ligaverunt ne videret 30
quemquam illorum et viliter fecerunt ipsum ascen-
dere unum equum con vinctum et commiserunt eum
quatuor barbaris ad custodiendum. [§68] Inte-
rim venit Rolandus cum so{d}alibus de
duodecim paribus et acriter invadunt barba- 35
ros. Rolandus vero percussit Corsabilem
per medium pectus. Ogerus occidit Athe-
nas. Ricardus vero Amangis. Sed breviter
non fuit aliquis eorum quin occidit no-
bilem paganum. Unde obtinuissent 40
ex toto victoriam. Sed barbari unani-
miter se recolligentes impetum ferunt
in Christianos et ipsos (ad) dimedium <mi>liar<ium>
retroire cogerunt. Et occiderunt Galie
et Will iam nobiles cum ceteris m<ili>t<i>bus> Christian<is> 45
et prostraverunt Bernardum filium <Ti>rri du-
cis et Gymerum nobilem comitem de
Ambroⁱs et fortiter eos lig<aver>unt. Et
proiecerunt eos super caballos devictos

ut ducerentur ad Admirandum regem pa-
 ganorum. [§69] Quod videns rex Karolus,
 anxiose proclamat bannum suum dicens
 "Ha, mei incliti barones modo evidens est
 quod estis nimis tepidi eo quod permittitis 5
 barones pro ducere comites meos cap-
 tivos. Ha, extendatis vestram consuetam
 probitatem eripiendo inclitos meos de ma-
 nibus barbarorum." [§70] Hec audientes mili-
 tes Christiani omni visu irruerunt in barbaros 10
 et ipsos prop{e}lluerunt in fugam. Rolandus vero
 obvians imperatrici eam dis<s>ecuit usque ad pectus.
 Unde non paucis ex parte paganorum interemptis
 velocius fugerunt producentes cum eis Oliverum
 graviter vulneratum, et comitem Bernardum, et 15
 comitem Gylmerum stricte ligatos.
 Barones vero illos attingere nequibant.
 Item capti sunt: Galfridus comes pernobilis
 de Antegania et Auberus <et> Gerarinus et cum
 ceteris sunt adducti. Rolandus vero cum ceteris 20
 Christianis invasit eos continue per illum diem
 usque ad vesperum, nec ad captivos valuerunt
 pertingere ad unum magnum miliar<ium>.
 †^ [§71] Karolus vero considerans noctem tenebrosam
 iminere, desistebant a bello suo, rever- 25

tentes cum exercitu ad sua castra. Cum autem
 pervenit ad locum ubi Fortibras de Alexan-
 dro iacuit, amaro corde dixit "O Sarace-
 ne, infortunium tibi eveniat. Tu vero fecisti
 me perdere inclitos meos et spiritualem meum 30
 Oliverum, quem intime merito dilexi. [§72] Fortibras
 vero elevans caput prout potuit, dixit ad re-
 gem "Imperator nobilissime fateor me
 esse devictum per Oliverum cui me totaliter
 tanquam nobili triumphatori condonavi. 35
 Petens sacramentum baptismatis, Unde
 nobile imperator concede ut habeam illud
 beneficium. Omnes deos m[e]<o>s tanquam vilia
 respuo et creatori me devote exhibeo.
 Spero quod si convalesco sic maiestati tuae 40
 deservire et leges Christi defendere contra barba-
 ros, quod verte[n]tur deo in laudem et vestre magnifi-
 centie honorem. Plus angit me captio
 Oliveri quam amaritudo plagarum mearum.
 Omnes reliquias quas apud Romam eripui red- 45
 dam tibi. Signum impiissime crudelitatis
 est me semimortuo perimere vel pati Sa-
 racenum perire." [§73] Imperator vero viscerose com-
 patiens iussit barones suos ut suaviter

† Capti: Oliverus, Galfridus, Bernardus,
 Auberus, Gilmerus, Gerarinus.

sisterent eum super suum clipeum. Ad cuius iussum
 confestim paraverunt barones et posuerunt eum le-
 viter super regis scutum. Et sic portaverunt eum
 ad lignum elevatum pro signo. Quo, cum
 fuisset quietus in lecto, Accurrerunt undique 5
 Galli ut eum videant admirantes decorem
 corporis eius et venustatem. [§74] Rex vero confestim
 vocavit Turpinum archiepiscopem dicens "Praepara
 festinanter ea quae pertinent ad sacramentum
 baptismatis. Volo ut iste rex ad votum 10
 suum baptizetur. Mox barones nobiles
 assistebant inter quorum manus apparuit quasi
 mortuus plagarum grandine. Episcopus vero impo-
 suit sibi nomen Florentinn qui est Rome
 sepultus Sanctus Florentius vocitatur. Tam en usque 15
 ad mortem, primo nomine utebatur .i. FForti-
 bras //. Imperator vero vocans duos medicos
 expertos, praecepit eis inquirere si posset curari.
 Qui invenientes interiora eius et viscera integra
 et intacta dixerunt quod infra duos menses satis 20
 convalesceret. [§75] Imperator placens ait "Laudetur
 deus. ☉ si habere Oliverum ceterosque barones
 iam captos qualiter iubilarem." [§76] Hiis omissis
 Saraceni adducunt celeriter et impetuose
 Oliverum cum ceteris baronibus et pertransierunt 25

pontem de Mantribil *et* venerunt ad civitatem
 de Egremor, ubi Balant admirandus erat.
 Brulandus vero Momiret celeriter descen-
 dens de equo adivit regem Balant. Rex
 vero sibi occurrens ait "Dic mihi Bruland, addu- 30
 xisti mihi Karolum imperatorem? Ostende mihi utramque
 expeditione[m]." Respondit Bruland "Satis male
 expedivimus. Karolus vero cum exercitu suo
 viliter nos devincit, *et* multos de regibus
et ducibus nostris interfecit. Et quod deterius 35
 est, Fortibras filius vester plagatus est usque
 ad mortem, *et* Christianus effectus est *et* baptizatus."
 [§77] Hoc audito, admirandus ad terram cecidit,
 quasi mortuus. Cum autem revivi{sc}eret cum gravi
 suspiro dixit "O Fortibras fili mi, quis est 40
 ille qui super te triumphavit? Ha, Maco-
 mete deus meus, quod peccatum fecit filium meum
 esse devictum. Qui tot devicit *et* super tot po-
 tentes triumphavit? Utinam prius fuisset di-
 laceratus antequam Christianus." [§78] Sedensque rex in sedi- 45
 li suspirans prorumpit in hec verba. "Dic mihi
 Brulande quis miles fuit tam potens?
 Qui superavit filium meum Fortibras in-
 vincibilem?" Respondit Brulandus "Domine

ille miles qui iam intravit vinctus cum
 oculis bendatis inter ceteros." Admirandus
 vero anxia voce iussit eum adduci coram
 eo festinanter iurans per deum suum quod
 morte turpissima moreretur cum ceteris. 5
 [§79] Unde Oliverus cum ceteris non modicum e-
 rant perterriti. Oliverus tum dixit suis sodali-
 bus "Nullo modo fateamur nomina nostra
 Admirando. Si vero h[ab]uerit notitiam nostrorum
 nominum, nulla erit nobis via evadendi." 10
 Ad iussum vero Admirandi religatur cum so-
 dalibus ante Admirandum. Est Oliverus coram Ba-
 lant adductus, satis pallidus et anxius. Cui
 Admirandus fur¹iens ait "Dic tu Galle unde es
 tu et quod est nomen tuum?" [§80] Respondit Oliverus "Ego sum filius 15
 unius vasalli pauperculi et de exili gente or-
 (ba)tus sicut et socii mei et vocor Garceret. Non
 multum vero sumus experti in probitatibus, quod tam de-
 nove dominus imperator creavit nos i[n] milites."
 [§81] Hec audiens, Admirandus exaltavit vocem 20
 suam dicens "O Domine Machomete qualiter sum
 deceptus. Credidi vero habuisse .v. de nobilioribus
 comitibus imperatoris. Et iam sunt min{u}s exciles
 quasi rusticales." Tamen ad se vocavit Barbe-
 cas camerarium suum dicens "Vade festinanter 25

prae para mihi tela ignita et ligari fortiter fac
 istos ut statim *cond*fodiantur ad columpnas
 aule marmoreas in *prae*sensia mea." [§82] Cui
 Barbachas respondit "Domine sol declinat ad
 occasum et cena nostra peribit, quae iam parata est. 30
Et dedecus erit nobis ipsos occidere tali
 tempore in absentia procerum nostrorum. Si placet
 sedeatis a prop<osito> vestro ad praesens et incarcerationum
 graviter Galli, usque cras ad ortum solis. Et tunc
 secundum consilium procerum nostrorum faciant." [§83] Cui Ad- 35
 mirandus "Placet quod dicitis." Statim vocatus
 est custos carceris vocabolo Brutamunt.
 Cui Admirandus "Praecipio tibi sub pena vite
 quod Galli isti in tecto carceris et gravi proiciantur
 usque in diem crastinum." Qui iussum regis 40
 complens illos vilissime incarcerationavit. Re-
 diens vero ad regem Brutamunt ait "Domine
 feci ut imperasti. Incarceravi illos Gall[o]s
 ubi carent omni lumine vermes vero serpentes
 satis habundant, ubi unus cāsus aque ma- 45
 rine subintrat per canale. Satis erit eis
 ista nox terribilis et dolorosa." [§84] Milites
 vero stabant in fundo carceris in medio aque
 usque ad pectora et qualitercumque meatum aque

obturaverunt. *Oliverus autem sepius factus est*
quasi mortuus prae angustia plagarum et sub-
mersus fuisset, nisi Bernardus et Gilmerus Scotus
subportassent eum. deo annuente columpne
altitudinis quindecim pedum invente // sunt, et illuc 5
elevabant Oliverum ceteri autem postea ascende-
bant et sedebant tediati. [§85] Oliverus vero suspi-
rans ait voce lugubri "Ha, pater mi Rey-
ner de cetero nunquam me videbis. Heu ma-
ritus i<am> sororis mee iam praepeditur." [§86] Cui 10
bernardus "domine non decet ut miles la-
mentet tanquam mulier, seu planga(n)t ita.
Potens est deus huic nos educere, sicut
rex Balant detinere. Utinam essemus ar-
mati super nostros dextrarios. O quam multi de bar- 15
baris perirent antequam ad locum istum nos perduce-
rent. // [§87] Inter haec Floripes filia regis soror
Fortibras ascultans audivit planctum illorum.
In pulchritudine et situ membrorum et in decentia
ornamentorum non fuit sibi similis inter mulieres, 20
Indumenta vero eminentis complacentie. Zona
quidem qua cingebatur imparis pretiositatis fuit,
in qua imprimebant lapides pretiosi quorum virtu-
tes magne fuerunt et mirabiles. Induta
mantello quae contexta erat in insula Colco- 25

nie ubi Jason quessivit vellus aureum.

Descendit de suo palatio cum xii puellis

nobili(bus) genere et intravit curiam regis, ubi

barbari lamentabantur Fortibras fratrem ipsius.

Mox inquit pro quo nobili fit tanta lamentatio. Di-

30

cunt ei "Domina pro nobili Fortibras germano tuo

iam per Gallos interfectus. Mox suspiran[s] emi-

sit gemebunda quasi semimortua. Unde maior

lamentatio excitatur inter eos. Tandem reversa

ad palatium suum plorans. Tandem ad se re-

35

versa post plorantium vocat ad se Brutamunt

custodem carceris et dixit ei "Qui sunt illi milites

apud te incarcerati?" Respondit Brutamundus

"Domina Galli sunt de familia Karoli qui

raro desistunt nos destruere. Et quorum auxi-

40

lio frater vester Fortibras iam occiditur. Unus est

inter eos, pulchriorem vel nobiliorem non recolo

me unquam vidisse." [§88] Cui Floripes "Bruta-

munde, supplico ut \wedge me cum eis conferre

\wedge sinas

per tempus modicum. Caute extorquabo (esse) eorum

45

unde et qui sunt et progeniem unde venerunt." Respondit

Brutamundus indignanter "Domina dominus meus rex

pater tuus i[n]hibuit ne quis loquatur cum eis.

Bene novi fraudem <et> dolum mulierum. Adhuc

bene recordor de uxore Haymeri ducis qualiter
 occidit illum Lausa<g>. Et post facta Christiana
 et Haymero desponsata. Non est maior ne-
 quitia quam mulieris malicia." FFloripes vero
 intime anxiata proloquitur "Gluto unde tu ta- 5
 lia <mihi> improperas, cum in nullo deliquisti?" Mox vo-
 cans \wedge se suum camerarium, iussit ut festi-
 nant^{er} afferret sibi palum unum, quo possent
 ostium carceris infrangere. Arrepto palo
 percussit Brutamundum in summitate capi- 10
 tis, et eum excerebratum et mortuum. FFrac-
 to ostio carceris, fecit eum proici in fundo carceris.
 [§89] Ac cum cecidisset in aqua ex tumultu cassus,
 milites sunt territi valde, credentes ali-
 quod monstrum dyabolicum carcerem in- 15
 trasse. FFloripes accenso cerio, intro
 prospexit iuxta unam de columnis ubi
 erant sedentes et a mero vultu dixit
 "Amici, qui estis vos? Et unde?" Oliverus respondit
 "Domina nos sumus de dulci Francia de fami- 20
 lia nobilis imperatoris Karoli. Admirandus
 vero iussit nos proici in loco isto. Ipse deus omnipotens
 liberet nos, quia angustiam istam non possu-
 mus sustinere diu. Magis vero placita est
 mors, quam ista pena." [§90] A[i]t illa "Ego faciam 25

 \wedge ad

vos extrahi de carcere ita tum quod fav{a}-
 tis petitioni mee et sitis mihi in auxilium
 in hiis quae vobis enucleabo." [§91] Cui Oliverus
 "Domina pro certo quia nunquam fuimus pro ditores,
 firmiter stabimus usque ad mortem ad bene vo- 30
 lentiam vestram complendam. Si placet,
 domina exhibeatis nobis aliqua arma et e-
 quos et spero quod non paucos de barbar<is>
 prosternemus et dirigere^{mus} ad inferna." Cui
 illa "Vasalle, tu prae sumis comminando 35
 iactare cum adhuc fueris in carcere detentus?"
 Cui respondit Bernardus "Domina bene nosis
 quod multi cantant ut dolores suos ob-
 liviscantur." Cui Floripes "Satis video,
 quod tu sis non vera de alba re et pro certo 40
 habeo quod plenarie domares unam
 pulcram domicellam in lecto sub corti-
 na amorose." Cui Gymerus Scotus ait
 "Domina usque Cavalonem vel Alexandriam
 vix invenies sibi parem in talibus." Cui 45
 illa "Certa sum quod tu es non modicus
 laudis fabricator." [§92] Advocans vero
 camerariam suam, iussit afferri sibi unam
 cordam satis longa[m] et grosam, ad quam

ligavit unum baculum firmiter ex transverso
 et eam ad milites sic descendere [fecit]. Quam
 cum milites apprehendissent s[ti]m fe-
 cerunt Oliverum baculum supersedere,
 <t>enentem cordam manibus ambab{u}s. 5
 Floripes vero una cum suis domicellis
 eum extraxerunt de carcere, et adduxer-
 unt eum ad cameram perlucidam. Redien-
 tes vero diligenter astiterunt ad ceteros
 milites attrahendos, quos amicabiliter 10
 ad dictam cameram Floripes perduxit per
 unam portulam antiquam per barbaros edi-
 ficatam. Et statim iussit ostium camere fir-
 mari. Camera vero non habuit sibi similem in
 amenitate et in decore in honestate in 15
 picturatione per universas terras. Quia longum
 est pulchritudinem eius et varias picturationes
 enarrare, breviter proceditur. Illam cameram
 filius Matusale fec<it> fabricari. Ex una parte
 camere erat quoddam praetorium nullo tempore carens fructu 20
 delicato vel floribus. In illo vero praetorio crescit
 Magdeglore .i. pomum omni morbo salutiferum.
 [§93] Cum Floripes erat filia regis de Gloir, Clare-
 munda perlucida alterius regis filia, Loreta cum
 ceteris puellis multis de nobili pro sapia procreatis. 25

Quedam vero magnostra ibi existens vocabulo

Maragunda, dixit ad Floripes evocatam

// "Pro certo istos milites ene novi. Iste est Oliverus

filius reymeri comitis pronobilis cuius filia

elucidat perpulcra inter omnes mulieres terre

30

ipsa soror Oliveri qui iam devincit Fortibras

fratrem tuum et interfecit. Ille sodalis est Bernardus

tantum in probitatibus commendatus. Tertius est

nobilis Gylmerus Scotus. Quartus est inclitus

Galfridus. Per Machometum deum meum cibum non

35

gustabo, donec denuntiem admirando domino meo."

[§94] Hoc audito, sanguis Floripes refrigescibat.

Tamen utens habundanti cautela, Vocavit

clamatione vetulam ad unam fenestram,

que se extendebat extra fenestram usque ad

40

femora cum Floripes locuta [e]st. Camerarius

vero considerans signa s*i*g*na* per Floripes sibi facta

et sciens eius voluntatem, Accepit eam per

tibias et ultra proiecit eam in mare. Quod videns

Floripes subrisit dicens "O vetula male

45

dimin{ui}sti. Per te de cetero non erunt Galli

perempti." Quod videntes milites multum

sibi regratiabantur. [§ 95] Ipsa vero dulciter amplexans

Unumquemque eorum, eos confortabat per verba

consolatoria. Respicientes *autem* Oliverum sanguinolentum pio affectu dixit "Vasalle video te fore plagatum." Cui Oliverus "Domina, ego sum lesus quodammodo in crure et in costa." Que respondit "Statim te plenarie curabo." Illa sumens de Magdeglorie portavit ei.

5

Quae cum Oliverus gustasset sanus effectus est sine ulteriori gravamine. FFloripes vero statim iussit mensam decenter ornata[m] prae par[ar](i)i, et cibos diversos delicatos cum diversis potibus deferri. Post vero refectionem fecit illos mundissime balniari, et sic fecit illos iuxta

10

caminum ignis confortari. [§96] Postquam hauserant potum electum, dixit FFloripes "Bene habeo notitiam vestram. Novi vero te esse Oliverum qui germanum meum superasti, et te Berardum, et gylmerum Scotum. Ego iam de gravi carcere liberavi vos. Nunc demonstravero vobis

15

secreta mea, et rogo ut foveatis negotio meo. Quando vero Admirandus pater meus Romam destruxit, et reliquias diversas violenter adquisivit, ego prospexi et vidi unum militem de Francia nepotem Karoli, obviantem

20

Lucifer de Blandas, et ipsum cum equo egregie prostravit. Unde huc usque prae ceteris mortalibus

25

dilexi *et ipsi soli observo corpus meum in virginitate, et ut sibi coniugar* <sacr>a maritali.

Tanquam fidei diligenter laboraveritis, Ego ero vobis in omnibus auxiliatrix, et ob amore eius obligo me fieri Christiana. " [§97] Quod audientes barones gavisi sunt gaudio magno.

30

Oliverus ^Λ vultu respondit "Domina in nullo oportet

Λ grato

vobis timere quin te parebimus usque ad mortem pro voluntate vestra complenda, cum tempus sit et locus." [§98] Bernardus vero impetu[o] spiritu dixit

35

"O si essemus armati bene super equos nostros-que et quantos faceremus dolores de barbaris?" Cui Floripes sub quodam risu dixit

"Iam fuimus nos hic in solatio. Vos estis hic quinque milites incliti. / Hic sunt quinque domicelle nobiles de nobili prosapia.

40

Quilibet vestrum eligat sibi unam ex illis, ad placitum et vestrum magis solatium. Ego vero me mundam et intactam continuanter observabo viro quem dilexit anima mea." [§99] Reynerus

45

vero pater Oliveri veniens coram Karolo graviter suspirans ait "Domine imperator pereamne Oliverum pervalidum filium meum militem? Dolore coactus mane arripiam

viam meam, si quos rumores de eo valeam
audire." Karolus vero imperator mox fecit
vocari ad se Rolandum. Cui dixit "Prae para
te festinanter quia oportet te cras mane
adire — Admirandum apud Egrimor.

5

Et dices ei quod reddat mihi integre omnes
reliquias quas Rome eripuit una cum baro-
nibus meis sanis et salvis. Sive autem,

Ego veniam ad eum et faciam eum suspendi
vel ad equorum caudas viliter pertrahi."

10

Dux autem Reymerus ait "Domine imperator,
non expedit quia si eum illuc mandaveritis
nunquam in posterum eum videbitis." [§100] Et Imperator

"Quia sermocinasti una secum ibis." Basinus vero
de Genevis dixit imperatori "Domine vultis vos

15

barones vestros gratis perdere? Bene consi{d}ero
quod si vadant nunquam redibunt." [§101] Cui imperator

"Et tu ibis." Tirri autem dixit imperatori "Domine considera
periculum futurum, quia si vadant, non est spes re-

deundi." Cui imperator "Et tu facies idem ne-

20

gotium." [§102] Gido vero dux Burgundie, et Ogerus

le Deneueis, et Ricardus comes Nor-

mannie, surrexerunt et steterunt erecti coram

imperatore, et cum reverentia regem alloque-

bantur, dicentes "Domine imperator, ut quid vultis

25

tam nobiles milites necare?" Quibus rex
 impatienter respondit "Et vos simul ibitis, et
 dicetis admirando, quod se convertat ad fidem
 Christi, et solvat mihi tributa de terris omnibus quas
 detinet, et quod mittat mihi Coronam Ihesu Christi 30
 cum ceteris reliquiis, quas eripuit quando occidit
 Papam Rome, et quod remittat mihi inclitos me-
 os. §§ in autem veniam et mediantibus gladiis
 auferam sibi omnia regna sua. Et ipsum tradam
 vili morte necandum. // Et super hiis <ir>as 35
 meas vobiscum deferetis sibi tradendas."
 [§103] Cum autem erant parati, Dux Reimerus de
 <V>elner dixit imperatori "Domine iam sumus omnes
 parati / detis nobis licentiam procedendi. Sed
 petimus quod si sit aliquis quem offendimus, 40
 quod nobis remittat pio corde." Et ecce
 Karolus licentiavit eos intime benedicendo. [§104]
 Qui equis calcaria submittentibus iter velo-
 citer arripiunt et sic diversas terras iam transe-
 unt. Eodem vero tempore Admirandus rex voca- 45
 vit ad xv. reges barbaros. Illis stan-
 tibus coram Admirando, Morodas primus
 de nobilioribus barbaris dixit regi
 "Domine ad quid coram vobis nos vocasti?"

Cui admirandus "Volo ut vos vadatis ad Karo-
 lum regem et dicatis sibi, quod iubeo ut deserat le-
 gem suam et credat Machometi et quod reddat
 filium meum Fortibras et quod teneat terras suas
 de me. ¶¶ In autem, Ego properabo ad eum, et eum mala 5
 morte interficiam. Et destruam omnem Christianitatem.
 Et in via nulli Christiano parcatis." Respondit rex Mori-
 das "Domine omnia fiant ad vestram voluntatem.
 Cum in Francia venero, spero necare x. Christianos antequam
 sim lassatus." / [§105] Omnes vero sodales idem prolocuntur, et 10
 equos calcari{bus} pungentes iter arripuerunt.
 Cum vero processerant ad unam dietam de Egrimor,
 Reimerus dux de Velner prospiciens vidit
 istos paganos viriliter equitantes. / Et ait Ro-
 lando "Quid proponunt isti barbari?" Cui Rolandus 15
 "Domine non est crepandum de eis, cum non sint ultra xx^{ti}.
 Satis bene ipsos consideravi." Cum vero se mutuo
 ornauerunt, mox Moradas prorupit in haec verba.
 "Estis vos Christiani? Vobis eveniat confusio." Cui
 Reimerus dux "Vasalle, minus <crude>liter loquaris. 20
 Huntii sumus domini venerabilis imperatoris Karoli
 ad Admirandum regem Saracenorum." Cui Mora-
 das "Vultis vos ipsos defendere?" Et dux Rei-
 merus respondit "Divino auxilio nos defendemus."
 Et Moradas "Quis vestrum mihi occurret?" Et dux 25

Reimerus "Ego tibi occurram libenti animo." Et Moradas "Stulte loqueris quia si tales .v. sicut et tu mihi occurrerent, viliter illos prosternerem." Et ait ad socios suos "Ne moveamini. Ego vincam illos *Christianos, et vinctos praesentabo Admirando.*" 30

[§106] Cum vero Rolandus haec audisset, ultra modum offensus ait ad Morandum "Nimis incipidus, et fatue vexant te vestre cogitationes inique, cu[m] iactantia vane glorie. Resiste mihi quia te viliter diffi[n]do." Mox subdunt equis calcaria, irr{u}entes cum lanceis qui bus confesti[m] confractis, extrahentes enses mirabiles ictus inferentes. Tandem

Rolandus furore ignescens interfectum Moradum prostravit ad solum. Quod videntes ceteri pagani loquebantur ad invicem furientes "Pugnemus tanquam strenui ut ipsum vindicemus." Qui tanquam furientes committunt bellum in *Christianos*. Dubium vero fuit in principio belli, quis eorum praevaleret. Sed domino auxiliante, occiduntur omn{e}s pagani, praeter unum qui velociter fugiens solus evasit. 40 45

I nec cessavit donec venit ad civitatem Egrimor. Et sine mora, se praesentavit Admirando. Cui rex Admirandus inquirendo, Mox ait "Domine rex, quomodo expedivistis negotia?"

Qui suspirans ait "*Domine divina fortuna nobis
 male ministravit. Septem vero glutones qui
 sunt de familia Karoli et mittuntur vobis
 pro nuntiis nobis obviaverunt. Et iam interfecerunt
 omnes reges praeter me solum qui vix solus evasi.*" 5
*Quae cum audisset Admirandus tanquam furore re-
 pletus ultra modum angustiat. [§107] Rolandus autem
 cum ceteris militibus descendebant de equis et
 quiescebant sub quadam arbore. Erant autem nimis
 vexati in illo conflictu. Tunc proloquitur dux 10
 Reimerus "Expedit ut revertamur, et enarremus
 domino nostro imperatori expeditionem nostram, (an) nullo
 enim valet nobis improperare." [§108] Cui Respondit mox Ro-
 landus "*Domine dux, non modicum admiror
 super verbis tuis. Ego deo meo voveo, quod 15
 nunquam revertar, quousque praesentabo me ad-
 mirando, cum istis captibus et denuntiabo
 sibi nuntium imperatoris.*" Cui dux Reimerus
 "*Si hoc feceris, nulla erit vobis spes evadendi.*"
 Respondens comes Tirri clara voce protendit 20
 "*Pro certo Rolandus bene proloquitur.*" [§109] Ad illud
 verbum omnes consurgunt, portantes secum ca-
 pita, versus Mantribil iter arripiunt duce
 Reimero praecedente. Cu[m] autem venerant ad Man-
 tribil, dixit dux Reimerus / "*Ecce hic civitas 25*"*

Egrimor, quo ire nobis est <re>cte." Respondens vero

Ogerus ait "Oportet nos prius pontem de

Mantribil pertransire, ubi sunt triginta arche

marmoree, et xx^{ti} turricule lapidee et in

quolibet turriculo xx^{ti} milites armati.

30

Murus vero circumam[p]le[c]tans se extendit in

altitudine usque ad xxx c<ubit>os. In la-

titudine vero xx^{ti} milites prout ambulare.

<D>ecemquinque vero viri validi assignantur ad inclinan-

dum pontem. Una aquila aurea in altum

35

sistitur quae relucet mirabili fulgore. Aqua vero

horribilis vocabolo FFflagol impetuosa

velocitate currit desuper distans a terra

per xv pedes. Batellus vero nec cu{rr}a vel

navis aliq{uae} <inn>[a]tare nequit in ea, propter suam

40

impetuositate*m*. Custos vero pontis principalis

est unus gigans fortissimus et horribilis." [§110]

Omnes vero perterri<t>i suspirantes dixerunt "Heu

qualiter possumus evadere omnia haec pericula transe-

undo?" Rolandus vero illos confortans dixit "Nichil

45

timeamus. Ego vero deo annuente de ianitore

vos liberabo." Cui dux Reimerus "Tu dabis

unum ictum ut recipias xx^{ti}. Procedeamus caute

in factum nostris. Vincamus eos per verba ficta et

adulatoria." / Ad hoc verbum statim pontem
 aderant. Quos cum vidit portarius principalis,
 vocavit bene ad centum viros armatos uno
 signo, Signatos ut dimitterent pontem ad
 ymum. Ponte dimisso, statim ascendit Reimerus 5
 dux pontem ceteris sequentibus. Quibus iani-
 tor affatur "quo tenditis procedere, et unde estis
 et venistis?" Cui respondit dux Reimerus "Nun-
 tii vero summus nobilis imperatoris Karoli ad
 Admirandum qui defensor nequissimus est rei- 10
 puplice. Et ecce nobis venientibus pro nego-
 tio nostro per imperatorem sibi denuntiando, Occur-
 runt glutones .xv. qui dextrarios nostros nobis
 eripere nitebantur. Deo auxiliante super ipsos
 triumphavimus, quorum capita nobiscum huc- 15
 usque detulimus. [§111] Quod audiens et videns
 ianitor, mirabiliter turbatus expav[ui]t. Tan-
 dem resumpto spiritu, dixit ad ducem / "Oportet solvere
 mihi tributum pontis stabilitum priusquam pontem
 transieritis. Tributum vero tale est: Oportet primo ut 20
 solvatis xxx canes leporarios simul copul-
 latus; / xx domicellas pulchras et castas;
 / et xx falcones bene volantes; / xx palfri-
 dos / et totidiem dextrarios rubeos; / onera {iiii}uor
 caballorum auri et argenti. Hoc tributum 25

cuiuscumque magni domini intrantis civitatem per
 istum pontem. Et qui ist<a> nequit solvere,
 relinquit caput suum pro tributo." [§112] Ad quod dux
 Reimerus {d}ulciter respondit "Domine inveniando
 sunt centum domicelle. Cum autem venerint, 30
 Elige tibi placidiora. Diversa et pretiosa sunt
 inveniando cum falleris nostris, omnia sunt tibi
 ad vestrum beneplacitum." Ad quod portarius "Ista
 sunt mihi placentia." Et cathenis relaxatis,
 sumiserunt pontem ad ymum, super quem omnes ingre- 35
 diuntur. Rolandus vero subridebat dicens duci
 "Satis congrua adulatione et deceptoriam perquisistis
 introitum." Rolandus vero pro ultimo se habens, vidit unum
 Saracenum nobilem solum, irrumpit in eum, et apprehendens
 eum per crura proiecit eum in aquam. Quod cum vidit dux 40
 <R>eimerus, ait Rolando "Centum demones te
 vexant. Tu vero facies furia tua nos omnis perire."
 [§113] Inter alia intraverunt maiorem portam de civitate
 Egrimor. Aspicientes undique vident d{ep}ic(a)tiões
 volucrum <eq^u>orumque <et> <anim>alium mundi. Tandem ob- 45
 vianc cuidam barbaro a quo quaerunt certum de admi-
 rando. Qui _____ <signi>ficavit admirandum quiescere sub tali
 arbore. Illi vero non desistentes, assistunt se
 in praesentia Admirandi. [§114] Dux vero Reimerus primo

pronuntiat negotium suum Admirando, in haec verba.

"Dominus qui salvat sperantes in se, salvet dominum meum

Karolum imperatorem et confundat regem Saracenorum Admirandum

qui nimis male servat rempublicam per regnum

suum. / XV glutones occurrerunt nobis in campo

5

ultra Mantribil, qui nitebantur afferre equos a nobis.

Sed bene dominus deus glorie, male expediverunt.

Quorum capita vobis detulimus." [§115] Quod videns

Admirandus nimis anxius. / Et Ecce qui evasit

ait Admirando "Domine vindicetis reges nostros

10

iam occisos. Isti glutones ipsos interfecerunt."

Admirandus vero dixit ad illos "Quare hic venistis?

Dicatis negotium vestrum." Dux vero <R>eimerus dicit "A[u]scul-

ta et audi mandatum Karoli nobilis imperatoris.

Mandat per nos quod reddas sibi Coronam domini

15

quam Rome eripuisti cum ceteris sanctorum reliquiis.

Et si non te faciet suspendi in patibulo tanquam

vilissimum. Et mandat quod mittas sibi milites

suos indempnes. Sin autem habebis cordam ut ca-

nis in collo ut sic pertraharis ad patibulum

20

per loca lutosa et fetida." [§116] Quod audiens Admi-

randus cum furore dixit "Contumeliose mihi impropera-

sti. Nunquam comedam donec vindicabis." Tunc

dixit Ricardus dux Normannie "Karolus impera-

tor tibi mandat, ut mittas sibi coronam Ihesu(m) cum

25

reliquiis una cum militibus suis *indempnis*. Et
 si non, tu eris membrati*m* dilaceratus". Tirri vero
 dux Arderne vultu horibili, superci- is [s]{u}is
 inclinatis. Quem cum aspexisset Admirandus
 incutitur tremore et dixit "per Machometum
 30
 deum meum, iste est prius dyabolus." Tirri dixit
 "Mittatis festina(n)ter reliquias cum militibus
 sanis et salvis domino imperatori. Aut eris
 vilissime suspensus." Cui Balant Admirandus
 "Dicas mihi pro certo si essem sub potestate tua
 35
 sicut tu es sub mea, quid faceres de me?" [§117] Et
 Tirri "Ego te suspendere*m* in al[t]o patibulo."
 Cui Balant "Pro certo hoc erit iudicium tuum."
 Hec eadem proloquitur Ogerus le Deneueis Ad-
 mirando, Rolandus autem prorupit in haec verba.
 40
 "Nobilis imperator Karolus tibi mandat ut
 dimittas ritum tue gentilitatis et con vertas tu ad
 fidem Christianitatis, et celeriter sibi mittas reliquias
 cum militibus. Vel faciat te suspendi cum in-
 genti confusione." Hoc idem proloquitur Gydo dux
 45
 Burgundie. Admirandus mox vocari ad se
 fecit {SS }ortibrond regem de Co(r)imbris cum
 aliis regibus ducibus et baronibus, quaerens
 ab eis consilium quid de illis nuntiis sit acturus.

Sortibrond prior respondit "*Domine dividantur membrati m. Hoc facto, recollige plenarie exercitum tuum, et quaeramus illum Karolu[m] imperatorem. Et cum captus fuerit, condempnetur vili morte. Tu vero coronaberis apud ipsum Sanctum Dionisium.*" Cui Admirandus "*Sanum est tuum consilium et sic fiet.*" [§118] Floripes vero filia regis Admirandi, et soror Fortibras iam conversi, audivit populum in aula regis tumultuantem. Et descendit et patri suo praesentavit se, dicens "*Pater mi, qui sunt isti milites qui coram te assistunt?*" Et Admirandus "*Filia hii sunt Galli de familia Karoli, qui viles contumelias mihi impropereant. / Filia praebe mihi consilium quid sit acturus de illis.*" Et illa "*Dividantur membrati m.*" Et Admirandus "*Bene dicaris. Quia bonum praebes consilium, Ita fiet. producantur statim illi milites qui sunt in carcere ut simili pena moriantur(i).*" Et Floripes "*Domine tempus multum iam transiit cum sit hora comedendi. Cibus vero vester iam est paratus, et si diutius expectaveris peribit. Committas eos interim cure mee, ego diligenter eos custodiam. Post refectionem vero, secundum benevolentiam vestram, fiat de eis iudicium.*" Cui pater "*Satis bene proloqui. Fiat sic.*" [§119] Sortibrond coram rege prorupit in haec verba "*Domine rex*"

nota

5

10

15

20

25

proponis tu {ad}hibere fidem alicui mulieri?
 Habeas in memoriam ducem Milonem qui sic
care nutrit illam Galefer, qualiter illa
 decepit eum et fecerit filiam suam prae pulcrum
 vocabolo Marsilion, Fraude et dolo exhere- 30
 tari." [§120] Floripes autem audiens tanquam furiosa
 "Dic tu false proditor, quid nequitie vel proditio-
 nis in me percepisti imponens in me maliciam
 aliarum mulierum? / Nisi esset ob reverentiam domini mei,
 putridos dentes tuos infringerem cum pugno." 35
 Cui pater "Filia dimittam us ista. Fiet secundum
 vestrum arbitrium." [§121] Illa vero conversa ad milites,
 quasi impatiens dixit eis "Vassall{i} ascendatis
 interim." Dux vero Reimerus "Quis unquam tam pul-
 cram dominam ^ Multum posset gaudere, qui ipsius ^ vidit? 40
 benevolentiam posset acquirere." Et Rolandus
 "Nunquam vidi tam decoram dominam. / quis dyabo-
 lus instigat te de dominabus nunc cogitare?
 Nichil loqui eo quod capilli tui fiunt cani" Et
 <R>eimerus "Quia miles sum et incumbit militi 45
 talia loqui." Floripes vero hoc audiens vultu
 placito dixit "Ista omittant(i)ur non enim duxi
 vos huc ut sit aliqua contentio, sed mutuum
 solatium." [§122] Intranstibus vero illis camerum, et

Rolandus videns Oliverum currit magno
 impetu amplexans eum. quot amplexus
 brachiorum <et> quants iubilus cordium erat
 inter eos, nequeo dicere. Tunc Floripes pro-
 rupit in hec verba / "Amici milites et peto 5
 ut sitis mihi propitii et coadiutores pro comple-
 mento negotiorum meorum, et ero vobis
 auxiliatrix et defensatrix in omnibus vestris a-
 gendis." Cui dux Reimerus "Sine fictione
 erimus undi[que] adiutores <sive> dolo Ita tempus 10
 quod nos defendatis contra <nostr>os persecutores."
 Cui illa "Quid est nomen tuum?" Et ille "Vocor
 Reimerus dux." Deinde illa dixit Rolando
 "Et tu quomodo vocaris?" "Domina vocor Rolandus
 filius Milonis de Anglie et filius sororis 15
 domini Karoli imperatoris." Cui illa "Dignus es
 venerari in omnibus." [§123] Illa vero cecidit ad pedes
 eius. Intime suspirans ait "Nunc vero secreta
 cordis mei denuntiabo. Ego prae ceteris
 mundi dilexi unum militem et adhuc di- 20
 ligo, vocabolo Gydo dux Burgundie.
 Pro cuius amore ero baptizata, si mihi volu-
 erit copulari <sacr>a maritali." Cui Ro-
 landus "Tu vides eum nec distat a vobis
 ultra mensuram duarum pedum." Respondit Flori- 25

pes "Supplico *et* rogo ut offeratis eum mihi."

Et *confestim* Rolandus *advocans* ducem

Guidonem dixit "Suscipe istam tibi uxorem."

Guido vero dixit "Pro certo non propono assumere mihi

aliquam uxorem, nisi ex consensu et assensu domini

30

mei Karoli. Cui illa "An nescitis quod vos

estis in d<ecret>o meo? Bene videtis quod salus et

vestra perditio in manu mea est. Vultis vos

gratis perdere [v]os <cu>[m]que ipsos?" Rolandus vero dixit

ad Guidonem sub silentio "Ubi unquam vidistis

35

magis decoram vel decentiorem corpore seu mo-

ribus ornata? Cum sit regali et nobili orta

natali, nusquam super terram talem invenies.

Karolus vero pro maximo grato habebit, si hoc feceris."

Guido autem dux ad haec verba eam amplexatus

40

est. Et arram tanquam sponse sue fidem sibi dedit.

Floripes maximo fluctuans gaudio dixit

"Honorificetur deus, eo quod dedit mihi illud quod item

semper amavi et totis visceribus mei{s} muliebri concupivi."

/ Et amplexata est Guidonem cum lacrimis prae gaudio.

45

[§124] Floripes quippe mox portavit unum pannum au-

nota

reum et pretiosum et extendebat illum in latitudine

et longitudine. / Rediens vero ad sua <....>lia de-

tulit coronam Christi cum ceteris reliquiis sanctorum et posuit

*super pannum dicens ad Rolandum "Domine haec
 est corona qua Christus fuit coronatus. Et hic sunt reliquie
 sanctorum quas tantum desideratis." [§125] Hec videntes
 milites se humiliter ad terram prostraverunt
 et devote adoraverunt. [§126] Interim unus paganus 5
 Lucafer de Baudas Ascendit et saluta-
 vit Admirandum sedentem in mensa quaerens
 An Fortibras ^{ia[m]} venit. Qui respondit "Non / Sed septem
 nuntii venerunt ex parte Karoli, et mihi viliter impropera-
 verunt. Et ipsos commisi sub cura Floripes filie 10
 mee." [§127] Cui Lucafer "Minus sapie[n]ter egisti
 committens eos cure cuiuscumque mulieris. Nam animus
 mulieris <facilis> est mutandus. Domine si placet
 ego ex parte tua vado videre quomodo se habent illi
 nuntii." Cui Admirandus "Vade cum benedictione 15
 Machameti." Lucafer vero confidens de regis
 amicitia et virtute propria, Ascendit ad cameram
 ubi milites mutuo loquebantur. Et veniens
 percussit ostium camere cum pede quod volavit in
 aera camere. Quod videns Floripes in timore angu- 20
 stiatur. Et vocans ad se Rolandum rogavit
 ut vindicaret se de tali rustico qui talem
 fecerat ni[mi]s violentiam. Et dixit / "Hic est ille qui mali-
 <ose nobis insidiatur. [§128] Ad hoc verbum Rolandus
 irruit. Sed dux Reimerus accepit paganum per 25*

guttur. Paganus vero strinxit ducem per guttur, nimis
dure quod ad solum fere prostraverat. Et dixit ad
ducem "Unde es tu inveterate?" Et dux "Ego
sum de FFrancia. Vocor Reimerus. Ego ut sub-
trahas manu[m] tuam de gutture meo." Cui pa- 30
ganus "Libenter quia tibi parco." Et paganus ad
ducem "Quales sunt ludi in partibus nostris?" Respondit
dux "Nil audivimus ex hoc in Gallia." Et
paganus "Inveterate ego edocebo te." [§129] Et
inclinavit et accepit faxem ingentem, et eum 35
tanto impetu sufflavit quod sintille sparse sunt
per cameram totam. Et tradens faxem ad ducem dicit
"Inveterate tuum est nunc sufflare." Dux vero insuf-
flavit impetuose sic quod sintille combusserunt
barbam et supercilia. [§130] Et cum faxe percussit pa- 40
ganum in capite unde duo oculi exiluerunt.
Et dixit "Tu ignorasti ludum bene ludere. Ego vero
edocui te." Et ait Rolandus "Valeat bra-
chium tuum quod ita bene talem ludum eo edocui-
sti." [§131] Floripes vero maximo fluctuans gaudio 45
dixit "Querat sibi nunc uxorem. Est{c} vero die
ac nocte blanditus est patrem meum maxima
dona promittens ut haberet me in coniugem.
Honora{tus} autem sit qui ab eo me <s>egre gavit."

Floripes inter diu dixit illis. "Nunc oportet
 quod nobis careamus. Admirandus quidem prae
 ceteris mortalibus istum dilexerat, et ad ipsum
 vindicandum cum exercitum veniat et vos intra
 turrim inclusos obsideat. Non erit cautela
 evadendi. Nunc cum modo sunt in mensis in cibando
 avidi nichil hesitantes, Armate vos de-
 center prout decet milites armari, Et
 descendatis in palatio regis dilaviantes
 eos a maiori usque ad minorem null{os} parcentes."
 Illi vero ad decretum consilii Floripes se ar-
 maverunt, / congrue descenderunt ad regis pala-
 tium Rolando praecedente et dilaviaverunt
 paganos velut luppi agnos. [§132] / Pagani
 equidem obmissis mensis et cibariis fugerunt,
 quo impetus eos adneccavit. Alii per fenestras
 saltantes crura fregerunt. Alii in aquam sunt sub-
 mersi. Alii miserabili fortunio sunt tran<s>dati. [§133] / In quo
 conflictu Oliverus peremit illum nobilem regem
 vocabolo Coldref. Admirandus vero viriliter fugit
 quem Rolandus sequebatur a dorso. Et prout extendit
 brachium cum gladio ut percuteret Admirandum
 saltantem in quadam fovea. Quo intacte percussit
 petram marmoream ad dimedium pedem. Quot
 autem de barbaris occiderunt, Horribile est videre.

Palatium cum turribus evacuatis barbaris plene
 rie capiebant. Cathenas vero de ponte cum per-
 tine[n]tibus sibi appropriaverunt. [§134] Sortibrond vero reperiens
 regem in fossa extraxit cum et dixit "Domine nonne prae-
 dixi tibi prae muniendo de malicia mulierum?" Cui
 rex "Satis tribulor. Non oportet nunc mihi improperare.
 Cras vero exercitum meum convocabo, ut turris proster-
 natur ad solum, et cremantur omnes illi glutones
 cum mea Floripes filia." Nocte cogente
 omnes petiverunt locum quietis. Aurora crastine diei
 apparente, congregat Admirandus exercitum suum in tantum
 quod usque ad quatuor leucas apparuerunt paganorum
 habitacula. [§135] Admirandus vocavit ad se Mal-
 pinum de Agrimore latronem, qui i[n] arte modo
 latrocinandi nullum habuit parem in terra, Dicens
 sibi "Vade et caute fureris zonam Floripes
 filie mee, quia nullus ibidem patietur famem
 si zonam aspiciat, unde sic modicum expedit
 turrim obsidere." Malpinus respondens ait "Sub vita
 mea mane tibi offeram zonam." [§136] Malpinus con-
 festim de nocte veniens transcendit murum turris
 tanquam scurellus, Postquam aquam nataverat. Invenit
 ostium camere ubi Floripes cum domicellis quievit
 clausum. Qui prorupit in carmen quod / quo dicto

subito *apertum est ostium. Et accendens quandam candela[m] quam*
secum portaverat, accessit ad lectum **FF** *lori-*
pes ubi dixit aliud carmen pro sompno imprimendo
et diligenter zonam quaesivit. Tandem invenit
Floripes zona cinctam, quam silenter ab ea ra- 5
puit et se ipsum cinxit. Accipiens ipsam per c rura
volens cum ea libidinem suam committere. Quae de gravi
sompno eviglans clamat "Ha domicelle
nimis profunde dormitis. Ha incliti mili-
tes nimis ad praesens distatis pro illo tempore. [§137] Gydo 10
de Burgundia stans prospexit exercitu[m] paga-
norum. Qui audiens clamorem Floripes insiliit
cum gladio abstracto et videns ipsum disse-
cuit / et confestim in mare proiecit. Unde de cetero
nescivit carmina proferre. Unde vero lux lu- 15
cebat, Ita magis apparuit quod multi videntes
eum prae timore fugerunt. Tunc Floripes suspi-
rans ait "Heu iam amisi zonam pretiosorem
auro immo omni thesauro mundi. De cetero
oportet nos curare de cibariis quod non esset necesse 20
si zonam haberemus. Et narravit militibus
circumstantibus gestum latronis. [§138] Aurora consur-
gente, Admirandus vocat ad se Bruland
de Munnifre, Sortibrand cum ceteris regibus et
ducibus ad suum consilium dicens "Certus sum, quod 25

Malpinus latro meus est peremptus. Hinc est quod
 volo quod sanum de <h>is consilium de turre quid sit
 agendum." Respondens Sortibrand ait "Domine
 fiat tumultuatio cornuum et buccinarum et
 exercitus tuus faciat impetuosos insultus 30
 cum arietibus et diversis machinis ut turris
 prosternatur." Et rex "Sicut dictum est fiat." Ad
 hoc verbum rex cum toto exercitu se parat ad
 turrem prosternendam. [§139] Floripes considerans gravem
 defectum cibariorum quem habebat facta est quasi (quasi) exani- 35
 mis. Quam confortabat Guido verbis dulcissimis.
 Guido vero coram omnibus affatur "Nos sumus hic graviter
 per barbaros obcessi, nec sunt nobis victualia
 pro diebus octo. Oportet necessario ut aquiramus nobis
 esculenta. Praestantius est e[n]i[m] nobis mori cum ho- 40
 nore quam cum decore vivere. Domicelle vero
 morientur fame. Primus enim malle[m] mortem
 sustinere. / Exclam[em]us et divi no fortuitu victua-
 lia acquiramus." [§140] Floripes qui ppe cum celeriter
 haec proponit. "<H>a quante potentie est ipse deus 45
 in quo prius credebamus?" Et cum hoc dixit ^Λ deduxit
 eos {per portul}am antiquam in synagoga[m] barba-
 rorum vbi erant d<e>i eorum dimisi ex auro pretiosis-
 simo .i. Margoth, ternegant, Iuipin, Apolin,

et ceteri multi aurei ymaginati cum diversis
balsamis et intecis et aliis pretiosissimis
iocalibus. Quibus visis Floripes dixit ba-
ronibus "Humilietis vos istis diis et adoretis
deprecantes eorum benevolentiam." Guido vero 5
prostravit I<ui>pin, et confregit. Ogerus disruptit
Margoth divisim. Rolandus vero prorupit
in loquendo [et] dicit ad Floripes "Minus pro certo
sunt dii isti potentes quia ex q<uo> sunt ad terram
prostrati, nequiunt se erig(er)en^s levare." [§141] Cui 10
Floripes "Certum est quod confusio mihi eveniat
si de cetero quemquam illorum adorem." [§142] Dehinc autem
descendebant ad stabulum quo nobiliores
dextrarii regis erant collocati. Illi confe-
stim prout decuit armati eligerunt equos 15
praestantiores. / quibus ascensis veniunt ad porta[m]
exeundi. Rolandus vero dixit ad Tirri de
Arderne<ii> "Custodias portam a_n pagani ne*
intrantes praevalcant." Cui Tirri "Quid in me
vidisti ficti<c>ie vel ti<mid>itatis? Quid ponar 20
in loco tali et non prosequar inimicos Christi?" Cui
Rolandus "Assumas tecum Ricardum ducem
Normannie ad tuam securitatem et nostram. Si
vero barbari praevenierint et praeoccupaverint por-
tam, nulla est nobis via evasionis quia po{n}- 25

t{e}m de Mantribil nequimus transire propter tantam
 barbarorum resistentiam, nec aquam ~~FF~~ lagor, propter
 cursus impetuosam violentiam unde necesse est
 ut custodiatur ad nostram indigentiam." [§143] Ad-

mirandus vero prospiciens extra palatium suum 30

et videns eos equitantes, Voce magna

clamat "Ha barones. Ecce video

Gallicos istos cum vexillis non p<racla>lis

velociter equitantes. Si vero evaser<in>t

nobis iugerint mala non minima." [§144] <Immo> 35

fecit bannum suum proclamari. Quo audito

omnes barbari armis se munierunt

viriliter ipsos sequentes. Rolandus un(n)a

cum ceteris haec videns et resistens, ad defen-

sionem cito peremerunt omnes primo occurren<tes>. 40

[§145] Clarion rex nepos Admirand[i] unus

de valentioribus paganis associat^{is} sibi

xv mili{a}que occurrit eis. Rolandus vero

obvians Ge<im>per regi ictu gladii

sui vocabolo Durendal ipsum dissecuit 45

usque ad zonam. Guido videns Clarionem

cum tanto impetu procedere direxit se

ad eum. Ad quem paganus sagittam unam

proiciens, Guidonis equum interfecit. <....>

This apparatus seeks to explain each editorial emendation. It will also offer comments concerning any fading in the quire. Where faded words have been restored, frequently the restoration has relied upon the corresponding word in the edited *Sdair Fortibrais*, here abbreviated to SF. Some restorations rely upon the *Chanson de Fierabras*, here abbreviated to CdeF.

Page 85, column 1.

Column faded, especially down the left hand margin, leaving words unclear and illegible. Headed by 'Hic incipiunt', written at the top of the column.

- 1.4 m[at]ris - suspension omitted.
- 1.4 cruc{e}m - MS. 'crucam' - an Irish-style spelling, with two broad vowels.
- 1.7 <a> - illegible.
- 1.7 Iude[i]s - 'i' omitted.
- 1.8 <sancta> - 's' illegible, 'cta' unclear, no suspension visible.
- 1.10 <Roma>no - 'Roma' unclear, edited thus by Esposito¹.
- 1.11 <ver>o - unclear.
- 1.15 <de>ligantis - unclear, restored from SF.
- 1.15 <.....> - illegible.
- 1.15 Lo[n]gitudō - suspension omitted.
- 1.21 ni{v}is - MS. 'nimis' - an Irish-style spelling, taking 'm' to be lenited.
- 1.22 Christian(i)orum - nominative form written, with the genitive ending squeezed in above - 'i' not deleted.
- 1.24 er<ec>t<o>s - unclear.
- 1.24 pro stern[er]e - contraction omitted.
- 1.35 ve[n]turu[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.38 committ(o)ere[n]t - erroneous 'o' not deleted, suspension omitted.
- 1.42 sua[e] - ablative form written - non-sensical.
- 1.44 exercit<iu> - unclear.

¹M.Esposito, in 'Une Version Latine du Roman de "Fierabras"', *Romania* 62, 1936, p.535, has edited the first sentence of the text.

- 1.45 <in> <manu> - illegible, restored from SF.
- 1.46 vo<c>ifer<ate> - partly illegible, restored from SF.
- 1.48 virtute[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.48 tua<m> <in> - unclear.
- 1.49 au{d}es - MS. 'auges', a confusion between the lenited 'd' and 'g' in medial position in Irish.

Page 85, column 2.

Column faded, especially down the right hand margin, leaving words unclear or illegible.

- 1.4 veniam(*que*) - 'que' contraction unnecessary.
- 1.24 <ro>gavi - 'ro' unclear, restored from SF.
- 1.27 <quaequam> - unclear.
- 1.28 ter(i)et - 'i' written erroneously.
- 1.34 me[a] - no trace of written 'a' due to fading.
- 1.35 forti<tudini>s - middle of word unclear.
- 1.36 magn{i} - MS. 'magna' - masculine form more appropriate.
- 1.37 subiect{i} - MS. 'subiecta' - " " " "
- 1.37 Pa<pa> - end of word illegible.
- 1.41 d<onec> - unclear.
- 1.38 e<l>landum - portion at end of 1.38 unclear.
- 1.45 two words illegible.
- 1.46 ad<versariu>[m] - unclear, restored from SF.
- 1.46 last two words illegible.
- 1.47 mostly illegible.
- 1.47 cu[m] - invisible suspension.
- 1.48 two words illegible
- 1.48 d<ix>isti - 'ix' illegible.
- 1.48 <quod> - unclear, restored from SF.
- 1.48 <milites> - unclear, restored from SF.
- 1.49 bell<o> - 'o' illegible.
- 1.49 iuvenale[s] - 's' invisible.

Page 86, column 1

- 1.23 sa[n]ctum - suspension omitted.
- 1.29 de<pl>acens - middle letters unclear, restored from SF.
- 1.34 grave[tu]dinem - 'tu' omitted.
- 1.41 blig<....> - end unclear. A word meaning 'band', as in SF. 'Ligamen' would be an obvious choice, rendering the initial 'b' redundant - see Page 90, col.2, 1.9 for a clear example of an unwanted initial 'b'. Another possibility would be 'obligatura', using the initial 'b', but this reconstruction seems rather too complicated.
- 1.49 ampliand{a} - MS. 'ampliando' - a confusion either between gerund and gerundive, or between the genders of 'laus' and 'honor'.

Page 86, column 2

- 1.10 <...>ona - first half illegible, not present in SF.
- 1.15 sub{ivi}t - MS. 'subeat' - preterite indicative more appropriate. Historic present would also be a possibility.

Page 87, column 1

- 1.19 mis(er)ere - extra syllable unnecessary for imperative form.
- 1.20 no[vi]sti - letters omitted.
- 1.33 (ad) - repeated 'ad'.

Page 87, column 2

Unclear around the right-hand margin in the lower half of the column.

- 1.2 in<f>ecisti - 't' unclear.
- 1.5 prog(r)eniem - 'r' is a spelling mistake.
- 1.18 ceteri(s) - ablative form erroneously written.

- 1.33 militia(*m*) mca(*m*) - accusative forms given by erroneous suspensions.
- 1.41 [non] - omitted in MS.
- 1.45 <o>ccurr<es> - very unclear, restored with reference to SF.

Page 88, column 1

- 1.2 s{ed} - MS. 'si'.
- 1.2 pugna<r>e - 'r' unclear.
- 1.2 <v>{olo} - unclear, but word appears as 'vis', i.e. the wrong person. Restored from SF.
- 1.22 sa[l]vabitur - 'l' omitted.
- 1.37 {m}e - MS. 'ne'.
- 1.40 [n]unquam - 'n' omitted.
- 1.40 s{ed} - MS. 'si', as above in 1.2.
- 1.43 lig{a}sse - MS. 'ligesse' - an Irish spelling using two slender vowels?
- 1.45 S[e]c[un]dus - suspensions omitted.
- 1.46 Te[r]tius - 'r' omitted.

Page 88, column 2

- 1.10 prostraver{a}(n)t - MS. 'prostraverent' - Erroneous use of the imperfect subjunctive. The number is also wrong for the sentence.
- 1.12 ext<ra> - 'ra' unclear.
- 1.13 [et] - added for sense.
- 1.15 q{uia} - MS. 'quae', wrong contraction used.
- 1.15 (et) - unwanted.
- 1.15 <d>ecus - unclear initial.
- 1.16 mortu{o} - MS. 'mortus'.
- 1.30 confu[n]daris - suspension omitted.
- 1.32 <vires> - unclear word.
- 1.39 {et} - MS. 'ab'.

Page 89, column 1

Base of the column unclear in manuscript.

- 1.10 p<art>tem - 'art' unclear, easily restored.
- 1.11 <nu>dam - 'nu' unclear, easily restored.
- 1.23 p<art>tem - as above, 1.10.
- 1.31 *victori{a}* - MS. '*victoris*'.
- 1.35 (d)ante - 'd' unwanted.
- 1.48 <.....> - illegible.
- 1.48 le<o> - almost illegible, reconstructed from SF.
- 1.49 <.....> - illegible.
- 1.49 o<ss{e}> - almost illegible, but appears to be written 'ossi'.

Page 89, column 2

- 1.5 *prae* pedit<us> - '*us*' contraction unclear.
- 1.24 erige[n]do - suspension omitted.
- 1.33 <matri>s - unclear, restored from SF.
- 1.36 s[e]c[u]ndum - not written clearly, suspension omitted.
- 1.39 *ins*<tarent> - second part illegible - restoration attempted from SF.
- 1.39 illo<rum> - contraction unclear.
- 1.44 t[ri]umphares - contraction omitted.
- 1.45 vind[i]cet - 'i' omitted.
- 1.48 <isto> - unclear.

Page 90, column 1

- 1.10 o{r}are - MS. '*otare*'
- 1.13 manu(i) - dative case used, ablative required.
- 1.19 qua[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.21 p<art>{e}m - 'art' unclear, MS. '*partam*', again the use of two broad vowels.
- 1.22 qua(n)dam parte(m) - accusative case used, ablative required.

- 1.27 mon[it]is - 'it' omitted.
- 1.45 morte[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.46 Inpla[ca]to - 'ca' omitted.

Page 90, column 2

- 1.4 no[n] - suspension omitted.
- 1.6 spe<ro> - 'ro' unclear.
- 1.9 (b)insani - 'b' an error.
- 1.9 dextrar[i]um - 'i' omitted.
- 1.11 celeri(u)us - this 'u' seems unnecessary.
- 1.11 i[n]siliens - suspension omitted.
- 1.13 pal(id)mam - 'id' an erroneous addition.
- 1.27 fund{o} - MS. 'funde'.
- 1.28 ebe(ta)tum - the verb 'ebibo' should have a consonantal stem.
- 1.29 {t}en<u>it - unclearly written, MS. seems to read 'senuit'.
- 1.30 insil[i]ens - 'i' omitted.
- 1.40 {r}esistere - MS. 'desistere'.
- 1.46 sens<im> - 'im' contraction unclear.

Page 91, column 1

- 1.1 fac(a)tam - extra 'a' an error.
- 1.4 a[d]iuvante - replacement of 'd' by a space shows a scribal misunderstanding.
- 1.5 sell{a} - MS. 'sello'.
- 1.10 abs[c]isa - 'c' added to avoid confusion.
- 1.20 p(l)aganum - 'l' an error.
- 1.34 delit{e}re - MS. 'delitore'.
- 1.40 <e>um - unclear.
- 1.42 latib<ulo> - 'ulo' illegible.
- 1.44 s[c]c[un]da(m) - poorly written word, reconstructed from SF - erroneous suspension over 'a'.

Page 91, column 2.

Unclear at the bottom right-hand corner of the column.

- 1.7 in<ter> - 'ter' unclear.
- 1.13 Co<rnu>bia - 'rnu' unclear, but the number of minims and the 'i' show it to be this as in SF and not 'Coimbra' as in CdeF.
- 1.25 i[n] - suspension omitted.
- 1.34 so{d}alibus - MS. 'solalibus'.
- 1.43 (ad) - unnecessary.
- 1.43 <mi>liar<ium> - 'mi' unclear, 'ium' illegible, restored from SF.
- 1.45 m<ili>t<ibus> Christian<is> - letters in brackets illegible, restored from SF.
- 1.46 <Ti>rri - 'Ti' illegible, restored from SF.
- 1.48 lig<aver>unt - 'aver' illegible, restored from SF.

Page 92, column 1

- 1.11 prop{e}lluerunt - MS. 'propalluerunt'.
- 1.12 dis<s>ecuit - second 's' unclear.
- 1.19 <et> - unclear.
- 1.23 miliar<ium> - ending unclear.
- 1.38 m[e]<o>s - unclear - one letter missing, the 'o' appears to be present.
- 1.42 verte[n]tur - suspension omitted.

Page 92, column 2

- 1.32 expeditione[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.39 revivi{sc}eret - MS. 'revivixeret' - confusion of present and preterite roots.

Page 93, column 1

- 1.9 h[ab]uerit - suspension omitted.
- 1.17 or(ba)tus - 'ba' unwanted.
- 1.20 i[n] - suspension omitted.

- 1.23 min{u}s - MS. 'minis', two slender vowels together.
- 1.33 prop<osito> - last portion illegible - an attempted reconstruction.
- 1.43 Gall[o]s - 'o' omitted.

Page 93, column 2

- 1.10 i<am> - 'am' unclear.
- 1.12 planga(n)t - incorrect number used.
- 1.28 nobili(bus) - this word should agree with 'genere' for the correct sense.
- 1.32 suspiran[s] - 's' omitted.
- 1.45 (esse) - unwanted.
- 1.48 i[n]hibuit - suspension omitted.
- 1.49 <et> - unclear.

Page 94, column 1

- 1.2 Lausa<g> - 'g' unclear, but appears to be this letter.
- 1.6 <mihi> - unclear, easily restored.
- 1.25 A[i]t - 'i' omitted.
- 1.26 fav{a}tis - MS. 'favetis', but the mood needs to agree with 'sitis'.
- 1.33 barbar<is> - final contraction unclear.
- 1.49 longa[m] - suspension omitted.

Page 94, column 2

- 1.2 [fecit] - added to make the sense clear - a scribal omission?
- 1.3 s[t]atim - 't' omitted.
- 1.5 <t>enentem - 't' unclear.
- 1.5 ambab{u}s - MS. 'ambabis'.
- 1.19 fec<it> - 'it' contraction illegible.
- 1.28 ene - 'b' unclear.
- 1.41 [e]st - suspension present, but no 'e'!
- 1.46 dimin{ui}sti - MS. 'diminasti', an incorrect a-stem preterite for an e-stem verb.

Page 95, column 1

- 1.9 *prae* par[ar](i)i - wrong element doubled - contraction mistaken for letter?
- 1.27 <sacr>a - unclear but meaning implicit.
- 1.35 impetu[o] - o-stem ablative required for adjective, not u-stem.

Page 95, column 2

- 1.16 *consi*[d]ero - MS. '*consicero*'.
- 1.22 Dene<u>eis - 'u' unclear.
- 1.35 <ir>as - 'ir' unclear.
- 1.38 <V>elner - initial unclear.

Page 96, column 1

- 1.11 equ<o>s - 'o' unclear.
- 1.11 calcari{bu}s - MS. '*calcariis*' - consonantal stem ablative required.
- 1.20 <crude>liter - first portion very unclear.
- 1.33 cu[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.35 diffi[n]do - suspension omitted.
- 1.35 irr{u}entes - MS. '*irrientes*'.
- 1.36 confesti[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.44 omn{e}s - MS. has contraction for '*omni*s'.

Page 96, column 2

- 1.12 (an) - error.
- 1.24 cu[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.26 <re>cte - 're' unclear.
- 1.31 circumam[p]le[c]tans - 'p' and 'c' omitted - no contractions used.
- 1.32 c<ubit>os - middle section unclear - restored from SF.
- 1.34 <D>ecemquinque - initial of this unorthodox numeral unclear.
- 1.39 cu{rr}a - MS. '*cuilla*' - emended word makes more sense as a Latinized version of the Irish word '*curach*' - 'rr' misread by a scribe as 'ill'.

- 1.40 aliq{ *uae* } - MS. has the contraction for '*aliqua*'.
- 1.40 <inn>[a]tare - initial part unclear, 'a' omitted.
- 1.43 perterri<t>i - 't' unclear.

Page 97, column 1

Faded at the base of the column.

- 1.17 expav[u]it - e-stem verb requires 'u' in preterite root.
- 1.24 {iiii}uor - MS. '*miuor*' - restored from CdeF.
- 1.27 ist<a> - 'a' unclear.
- 1.29 {d}ulciter - MS. '*mulciter*'.
- 1.41 <R>eimerus - initial unclear.
- 1.44 d{ep}ic(a)tiones - MS. '*dilicationes*' - attempted restoration.
- 1.45 <equ>orumque - first part very unclear.
- 1.45 <et> <anim>alium - '*et anim*' illegible - attempted restoration.
- 1.47 <signi>ficavit - '*signi*' very unclear.

Page 97, column 2

- 1.13 <R>eimerus - initial unclear.
- 1.13 A[u]sculta - 'u' added for clarity.
- 1.25 Ihesu(m) - suspension not required.
- 1.28 superci[li]is - 'li' omitted.
- 1.28 [s]{u}is - MS. 'iis' - 'suis' makes better sense.
- 1.32 festina(n)ter - unnecessary suspension.
- 1.37 al[t]o - 'l' uncrossed, not indicating a following 't'.
- 1.47 {SS}ortibrond - MS. 'FFortibrond', showing a confusion of names.
- 1.47 Co(r)imbris - shows confusion between CdeF '*Coimbres*' and SF '*Cornubia*'.

Page 98, column 1

- 1.3 Karolu[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.17 *produc{a}ntur* - MS. '*pro ducuntur*' - subjunctive mood required.
- 1.18 *morian*tur*(i)* - final 'i' unwanted.
- 1.26 {ad}hibere - MS. 'dahibere'.
- 1.38 Vassall{i} - MS. 'vassalle' - number incorrect.
- 1.45 <R>eimerus - initial unclear.
- 1.47 omittant(i)*ur* - extra 'i' unwanted.

Page 98, column 2

A faded column.

- 1.3 <et> - contraction unclear.
- 1.3 quant<u>s - 'u' illegible.
- 1.10 <sive> - very unclear.
- 1.10 t<emp>us - unclear.
- 1.11 <n*ostr*>os - unclear.
- 1.12 Qu{i}d - 'i' superscript omitted, hence contraction reads 'Quod'.
- 1.23 <sacr>a - very unclear, restoration from sense.
- 1.32 d<ecret>o - middle portion very unclear, restoration from sense.
- 1.34 [v]os - 'v' omitted
- 1.34 <cu>[m]que - 'cu' unclear, but suspension appears to be omitted.
- 1.44 mei{s} - MS. 'meio', a confusion between 'o' and final sigma.
- 1.48 <....>lia - unclear - no restoration possible from SF.

Page 99, column 1

Base of the column unclear.

- 1.8 ia[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.11 sapie[n]ter - suspension omitted.
- 1.13 <facilis> - illegible - restored from SF.

- 1.24 mali<t>iosc - 't' unclear.
- 1.30 manu[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.41 exil<u>erunt -- 'u' illegible.
- 1.46 Ist{e} - MS. 'isti'.
- 1.49 Honora{tus} - MS. 'Honoram' - nonsensical.
- 1.49 <s>egre gavit - 's' illegible.

Page 99, column 2

- 1.10 null{os} - MS. 'nulli' - accusative required.
- 1.18 tran<s>dati - 's' illegible.
- 1.28 pertine[n]tibus - suspension omitted.
- 1.39 i[n] - suspension omitted.

Page 100, column 1

Faded, unclear at the bottom left-hand side.

- 1.11 exercitu[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.27 <h>is - 'h' unclear.
- 1.35 (quasi) - repeated word.
- 1.40 e[n]i[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.45 <H>a - unclear due to red infil.
- 1.47 {per portul}am - MS. 'et posternam' - nonsensical, restored from SF.
- 1.48 d<e>i - 'e' illegible.

Page 100, column 2

Faded, very unclear at base of column.

- 1.6 I<ui>pin - 'ui' unclear, restored from CdeF.
- 1.8 [ct] - added for sense.
- 1.9 q<uo> - contraction unclear.

- 1.10 crig(*er*)ens - contraction unwanted.
- 1.16 porta[m] - suspension omitted.
- 1.18 Ardern<ii> - 'ii' unclear.
- 1.20 ficti<c>ie - 'c' unclear.
- 1.20 ti<mid>itatis - 'mid' illegible, easily restored.
- 1.25 po{n}t{e}m - MS. 'portam' repeated.
- 1.33 p<raela>tis - very unclear - restored from SF.
- 1.34 evaser<in>t - 'in' illegible.
- 1.35 <Immo> - Very unclear - attempted restoration.
- 1.38 un(n)a - suspension unnecessary.
- 1.40 occurren<tes> - 'tes' unclear.
- 1.41 Admirand[i] - 'i' omitted.
- 1.43 mili{a}que - MS. 'milibus' - accusative required - a miscopying.
- 1.44 Ge<im>per - 'im' unclear.
- 1.49 <....> last word on page illegible.

Additional Notes to *Gesta Karoli Magni*

This section provides a small selection of comments concerning for the most part the spellings employed in the manuscript. Note, it will not be overly concerned with proper names, except where there are major inconsistencies in the spelling.

Page 85, column 1

- 1.6 Ierosolimis - the ending may seem curt, but it reflects the nominative form Ierosolim used in Page 87, col.1, 1.45.
- 1.13 optinuit - the phonetic 'op' spelling is used frequently in the text.

Page 85, column 2

- 1.28 ocidam - the singling of the 'c' could be considered a mistake, as elsewhere, the double 'cc' is used for this word. But see Page 86, col.2 below.
- 1.28 aliquanda - note 'nd' spelling - a reflection of eclipsis upon 'nt' spelling?

Page 86, column 2

1.40/1 *acedo* - another word with single 'c' spelling.

Page 87, column 1

1.17 *Geniove* - clearly Irish version of the name for Genoa. But unclear if it is original as it is written in blue ink. SF seems to preserve a form more like the French '*Genes*', edited by Stokes as '*Egne*'.

1.39 *Sarracenus* - spelling with double 'rr'. This is not always the case.

Page 87, column 2

1.18 *Le Deneuis* - the preservation of the French form of '*li Danois*'.

1.49 *equm* - note the shortened spelling using single 'u'. Frequent in non-ablative cases in the singular.

Page 90, column 2

1.28 *ebetum* - dictionary has '*ebitum*'.

Page 91, column 2

1.28 *Saracene* - example of this word spelt with single 'r'.

1.40 *obtinuissent* - the 'ob' spelling of the prefix is used here.

1.45 *William* - written as if it were '*Uulliam*'.

Page 92, column 2

- 1.40 fili mi - note the short classical vocative cases used.

Page 94, column 1

- 1.44 Cavalonem - it would be more sensible if this name were written 'Babylon', following the information about the capital of Egypt given in the *Itinerarium* and by following the *Sowdon of Babylon*.

Page 95, column 2

- 1.37/8 Reimerus de <V>elner - this should not be thought of as the same character as 'Reyner de Geniove', although there is some confusion in the mind of the scribe. CdeF calls him 'Naimles de Bavière'. At times, it is unclear if the initial letter of this name is 'R' or 'N'. It has been normalised to the clearer 'R' for convenience.

Page 96, column 2

- 1.34 Decemquinque - an idiosyncratic version of 'quindecem' written in blue ink. It may have replaced the correct numeral by the highlighter using blue ink.
- 1.37 Flagol - This river has been plausibly identified as the Tagus in his discussion of placenames in the *Chanson de Fierabras*².

Page 97, column 1

- 1.10 reipuplice - correct declining of this compound noun.

²See A.de Mandach, *Naissance et Développement de la Chanson de Geste en Europe* vol.5, Geneva, 1987, pp.37-49. De Mandach identifies the river as the Tagus and shows the places in one small area that fit the names of the bridge of Mantrible and Egrimor. This ascription of place is most applicable to the twelfth century, the time of the origin of the *Chanson de Fierabras*, as the Tagus formed a natural frontier between Christian and Muslim Spain at that time.

Page 98, column 1

- 1.1 Sortibrond - this name is usually spelt 'Sortibrand', showing potential for confusion between 'o' and 'a'.
- 1.7 *nota* - the entry of Floripes is highlighted.
- 1.29 *prae pulcrum* - an example of the '-h-' being dropped from forms of 'pulcher'.

Page 98, column 2

- Head *nota bene* - this page is particularly significant.
- 1.46 *nota* - the reason for the NB is that Floripes displays the Relics of the Passion to the French Christian knights.

[§1] Here begins the History of the Deeds of Charlemagne, etc., just as it is told in the manuscripts of Saint Denis, alongside all the other such histories.

After the death of the venerable Helen of blessed memory, mother of the emperor Constantine, who, as a pious daughter of the Holy Church of Jerusalem, took the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ away from the Jews along with his Crown and the rest of the relics of the saints, the Cross was divided into fragments; these were presented, through pious devotion to the Holy Church, to different holy places. At length, the Crown, along with the Nails and the rest of the relics, were presented to the Roman Pope in Rome.

[§2] At the time when the noble Emperor Charles was reigning as king in France, an admiral, who had power over all the pagans, arrived. He had a son called Fortibras, to whom hardly anyone was worthy of being compared in honour and valour. He was of steadfast renown in many ordinary matters. He was fifteen feet tall. In any case, his strength was so great that he triumphed in every field of battle. Also he had a legitimate sister called Floripes, who surpassed the women of the whole kingdom with her grace. (Believe me, the brightness of snow did not outshine her flesh!) Now the raging admiral, along with Fortibras his son, strove to destroy the whole of Christendom by unceasingly knocking down buildings and martyring saints in various locations. At last, after coming to Rome, he killed the Pope called John. He put the monks, or whichever holy men were there, to the sword. Consequently, with the city overcome, he ordered the Crown of Jesus, along with the other relics to be carried off with him, as far as the tower of Egrimor.

[§3] Then Emperor Charles, who was keen to remove the Relics from the hands of the barbarians, mustered his army along with his twelve peers and, by proceeding swiftly, crossed the Kingdom of France and pitched his tents at a distance of twelve days' journey from Egrimor.

[§4] Now Fortibras, after learning from a report that King Charles was on the point of arriving, mustered fifty thousand armed troops for himself, and arranged them so that forty thousand could start a battle with the Christians, and ten thousand, who were desirous of attacking Charles sneakily, could hide in the bushes until they should hear his signal. However, trusting in the steadfastness of his courage, he came armed to the tent of Charles that had been pitched by a tree. For this excursion, he hung a shield from his neck and held a spear in his hand. And sitting on his war-horse, he shouted vociferously "Oh King Charles, with your florid beard, come and show me your strength by contending with me, if you dare. If fear has struck you, send Roland or Oliver or any such nobleman. And should he be afraid to fight alone, let two of them come. And if four or five of them come to fight against me, I shall not fear them. And if you do not do this, I shall come with a powerful throng and I shall overpower you and kill your noble knights, and I shall destroy your kingdom completely."

[§5] In the meantime, the pagans violently charged into the Christians, starting a terrible battle. And had Charles not come over to help, Roland, along with the twelve peers, would have been defeated and the barbarians would have gained the victory. In this conflict, Oliver, after having killed many pagans, was seriously wounded.

[§6] After accomplishing all this, he returned to his tents with the army. Lord Charles ordered the tables to be set for dinner. And after he had started to become inebriated with strong wine, he blurted out these boastful words "The old knights were more

valiant in the battle than the young ones ." At this, Roland and the rest of the young knights were most indignant.

[§7] Then, on the following day, when King Charles was about to eat, Fortibras shouted at him again, saying "Oh Charles, I can see now that you are frightened, since you are not coming, nor are you sending anyone to fight against me as I requested. I swear by my god that if they do come, I shall spill their blood like water. For I have defeated the kings of Christ by myself in the field of battle. There will not be a single day passing on which I shall not kill a number of Christians, unless you grant my request."

[§8] Now King Charles, after hearing all this, asked Richard, Count of Normandy if he had any information about this man, since the count had travelled in many and varied lands. In response, the count said "Lord, know for certain that there is not to my knowledge anyone of greater worth or courage. For he is King of Alexandria, and five magnates are subject to him. This man invaded Rome. The Pope perished, along with many Christians. He carried the Crown of Jesus off with him, along with the relics of the saints. There is no-one who has the ability to resist him in battle."

[§9] To this the emperor said "I shall not taste food until he has someone to fight him". And he called Roland to him and said "Array yourself in order to fight with this pagan."

[§10] And a very indignant Roland replied "By [Saint Denis, rather than meet] this adversary, I would prefer to be [torn to pieces]. When you, [old man], were [filled with wine], you said, when your young knight Oliver is seriously wounded, and not a single old knight had any trouble, that the old knights were stronger in the battle than the young knights. Therefore send one of your old knights against the pagan, one who

will defend your kingdom and your honour. I am promising for certain that should any of my companions go into that battle, he will be an enemy of mine in the future. Now, old man, you can defend the Kingdom of France and your own honour!"

[§11] Now the maddened emperor was holding a gauntlet, and he struck Roland with it in the teeth so that blood flowed out. On seeing the blood, Roland boiled with fury. And after drawing his sword, he prepared to strike the king. But he was prevented by the bystanders. The furious king ordered the bystanders to take him and bind him, swearing by Saint Denis that he would die shamefully. Roland, who was standing like a wild, grizzled boar, prevented anyone from placing their hands on him, saying that if anyone should attempt this, he would die.

[§12] Then the emperor, excessively inflamed, said to those standing around, "Have you ever come across any greater offence than the person, who is bound in the natural law of the holy flesh and blood to defend me, striving to destroy me?" Then Duke Ogier said to Roland in a soft tone "You have not spoken with total reverence to the Lord Emperor." To which Roland said "Is it any wonder if I am mad?"

[§13] Then Duke Reyner, soothing the king, said in soft words "Lord Emperor, let these things be ignored and let your foresight look ahead for someone who has the strength to go into battle against the pagan." Meanwhile, someone went to Oliver, who was lying on his bed due to the seriousness of his wounds, and related how the pagan had challenged the king to fight, and told him all about the difference of opinion between the king and Roland and that none of the knights had offered to fight.

[§14] Consequently Oliver, deeply upset, got up quickly, and ordered the bystanders to bind his wounds with a band of silk. When the wounds had been bound, he said to

the bystanding Garin "I am off to fight against that barbarian." Garin said to him "Lord, do you want to die *gratuitously* ? It is well known to everyone that if you enter yourself into combat, you will never return alive. God does not want you to expose yourself to so great a crisis or danger."

[§15] Oliver said to him "No-one of valour ought to hold back from developing his own fame and from adding to the magnificence of Emperor Charles. So if I fail him now, how will he have faith in me in the future? In such urgent business, a faithful friend is proved. Bind my wounds and bring down my arms immediately and don't delay." Garin, not daring to resist him, brought out his arms with which he was properly armed. He girded himself with the sword called Hauteclere, and then, mounting his war-horse Ferrant of Spain and not touching the [.....] of the saddle because of his agility, he hung a suitably decorated shield from his neck.

[§16] Surrounding himself with a golden belt, protecting himself with the sign of the cross as a famous knight, and drawing his lance for the fight, he spurred his war-horse, hurrying to the presence of Charles. And when he came into the presence of Charles and the rest of the twelve noble peers, he greeted the venerable emperor and gently said to the emperor "Lord Emperor, I ask that you should not treat what I have to say with disdain. In your wisdom, you well know that since I became united to Roland your nephew, I have received no payment, even though I have quite frequently exposed myself to the danger of death in order to magnify your glory. Now I devotedly beg you that you give me some payment." The emperor said to him "That I do know well enough. Hold on until we have returned to France and there I shall reward you as much as you please, and I shall enrich you with castles, towns and a large number of sizeable estates.

[§17] Oliver said to him "Lord, I am not asking for these things. I am asking that you allow me to fight with the pagan. And for all my service, I am asking for no more than this." Now everyone who was standing nearby admiring him said in a murmur "This man is asking for a stupid thing. We well know that if he goes into battle with the pagan, he will die since he is seriously wounded and disabled from a large loss of blood."

[§18] And the emperor said to him compassionately "Oliver, my friend, go and lie quietly on your bed. Forget the idea that you should go into battle since you *are* seriously wounded. I am not granting you this at all because of the grave danger and the outstanding shame and trouble which could result from this."

[§19] On seeing this, Roland was very saddened by the fact that he had rudely assailed his uncle, and he would have gladly joined battle, had Oliver not preceded him. Two traitors called Ganelon and Erdre, who used to strive to betray the twelve peers of France as far as they could, got up in reply to this and said to the emperor "Lord, in France you made it law that if two of the peers decree that something should be done and they are both consenting on this, it is considered to be settled and firm. Now, in following your statute, we adjudge that Oliver should fight with the pagan, since he presents himself by his own free will and not at anybody's request."

[§20] Now the emperor, realising their malice, replied impatiently "Oh traitors, you have talked yourselves into trouble. I swear by Saint Denis that if he should die as a result of your words, all your children will be destroyed and you both will die a most disgraceful death. I am now giving him the license to fight. May he go in the name of Christ." Then Ganelon said in a whisper to Erdre "The count will never return alive." Then the emperor handed over his gauntlet to Oliver as a sign of his permission.

[§21] Then Reyner, the Duke of Genoa and father of Oliver, after witnessing these events, bowed to the feet of the king with a bitter heart, saying "Lord, have compassion on me. Have mercy on my son. You well know that he will be seriously injured. How can he fight properly with the gravity of his wounds and with the serious bleeding from his leg? Lord, may your judgement see his stupidity." The emperor said to him "Now he has been given my glove, it is not possible to retract the permission."

[§22] Then Oliver, turning to the bystanding dukes and barons, humbly asked for forgiveness if he had given them offence in any word or deed. Sighing because of this, they all asked God that he should return in good health with honour. And so Oliver, having received the blessing of Charles and having picked up his spear, went all the way out, an undaunted knight, and came to the hill. After climbing it, he cantered along until he came to the place where the pagan Fortibras was lying unarmed under a tree. He, on seeing Oliver, snubbed him undeservedly by refusing to get up in front of him.

[§23] Oliver said to him "I beg of you, Saracen, tell me who you are, and where you are from, and what your name is."

[§24] The Saracen said to him "I am called Fortibras, and I am the King of Alexandria. I have five kings who are subject to me along with many other conquered magnates, so that no-one has, in my opinion, become wealthier than me. I destroyed Rome and I killed the Pope along with many Christians. I carried off the Crown of your Christ along with the rest of the relics of the saints. Also I subjugated the city of Jerusalem including the sepulchre in which your god lay. And who is it who is going to stand against me?"

[§25] Oliver said to him "Yours is the bragging of sorrow and not of valour, since you disparaged your creator. Get up quickly, arm yourself because the outrage which you inflicted on Christ, I shall avenge on you, and unless you arm yourself quickly, I shall pierce you with this lance."

[§26] Now Fortibras, on hearing this, laughed and said "I beg of you, tell me your name and house." To which Oliver said "Before the setting of the sun, you will have got to know my name. Lord Charles has sent word via me that you should reject your rite and be baptised and believe in Jesus Christ, and that you should return the Crown to him along with the rest of the relics. But if you do not, I shall hand you over to him, tightly bound, being hauled basely like a thief. He will, for his amusement, consign you to a terrible death. So, quickly prepare yourself for combat."

[§27] Fortibras said to him " Let me tell you for certain, if you see me armed, your audacity will be converted into terror and fear." And then he added "What sort of person is Charles, and Roland his nephew, Oliver, Ogier the Dane, and all the others about whom there is much talk amongst the people?"

[§28] Oliver said to him "I assure you that in all the world, there is no-one like Charles in worth or in valour. Roland is a very strong knight, and he triumphs in every battle. Oliver is a accomplished knight who is like me in appearance. Ogier is a famous knight, a well-proven expert in battles."

[§29] And Fortibras said "Why then were none of them sent to fight with me? " To which Oliver said "Because they are scorning you and holding you in contempt."

[§30] Fortibras said to him "Then I beg you to tell me your name and your house." Oliver said to him "I am called Garin from Perigord, and I am the son of a vassal who

is called Iacereth. And recently King Charles dubbed me a knight and sent me to contend with you. Fully arm yourself quickly, or, because of my warlike nature, I shall pierce you with my lance."

[§31] On hearing this, Fortibras lifted his head without any sign of impatience or anger, leant on his shield and said "I have never been used to fighting with such ^a lowly vassal, and would it not be considered a disgrace, I would instantly cut off your head for myself. Indeed I have been accustomed to struggling with kings and dukes and nobles of the lands, and not with such a vassal." Oliver said to him "I assure you that I will not tarry any longer today before I start filling you full of holes, unless you array yourself quickly."

[§32] Fortibras said to him "I notice your animosity and your desire to fight. Now I am making a *submission* to you that I have never made to anyone hitherto. I shall climb onto my war-horse, and when you meet me with your lance, I shall fall from my horse which you will take with you to the dukes, saying that you knocked me down."

[§33] Oliver said to him "Like it or not, I shall lead your horse with your head." To which Fortibras said "I can see nothing wrong with you if it weren't for the fact that fighting with such a lowly person might be reckoned to be dishonourable. I beseech on behalf of your spirit of chivalry that you grant my request, or that you find Roland or Oliver or Ogier or any nobleman so that my honour might not be debased. Alternatively, let two or three of these very valiant men come against me, because it is honourable to struggle with men such as these." Oliver said to him "Before the sun sets, I shall humiliate your boastful arrogance. Therefore I am ordering you to prepare yourself before I pierce you."

[§34] At this Fortibras lifted his head, looked out and saw the blood of Oliver dripping onto the ground, and said "Oh vassal, I see that you are wounded. Where is that blood flowing from?" To which Oliver said "I spurred my horse fiercely. The blood is coming from him."

[§35] Fortibras replied "I am certain that the blood is trickling from under your breastplate. Now I have with me two tiny flasks filled with the precious balsam with which Christ was rubbed when he was placed in the sepulchre that I acquired for myself when I destroyed Rome. If anyone takes a little sip from them, he will be cured from every wound and weakness. So take them and taste a little of it, so that when you are fit, you will fight more bravely and more strongly, and that will be more honourable for me."

[§36] Oliver said to him "I shall not taste it until I win them in battle. Cease your boasting words, and come and demonstrate your words in action."

[§37] Then Fortibras got up, moved himself forward and drew himself up to his full height of fifteen feet and said "Garin, I can still have compassion on you. I am asking you to do as I said and mount your horse and bring out any able nobleman who will contend with me, or else drink some of the balsam for your health and strength and for my own reputation." And when Fortibras was certain that Oliver was not going to give in to him on any point, he asked him humbly to help him to arm. Oliver said to him "Fortibras, do you trust me enough in the short term that you should wish to be armed by me?" And Fortibras "I can well perceive from my observation and your way of behaving that hitherto you have not been a traitor, but a man who hates treachery. I have never been a traitor, and I have always held traitors in contempt."

[§38] Then Oliver armed him in the best way he knew. Seeing this, Fortibras said "Garin, I am engaging many things for you, because I am aware and I know that I have not bound myself to be armed for a long time."

[§39] Then Fortibras, showing three swords to him, said "Look at these three swords, all ready for use. One is called Plorans. The second is called Bapteym. The third Graban. Better ones are rarely to be found in these lands. Now there were three brothers who were all blacksmiths, called Golians, Munificas and Agrifax. There were none more skilled in these lands. Golians forged Hauteclere, Joyus and Fortbrige. Munificans forged Durendal, Sanguine and Curtem. Arifaxat forged Bapteym, Plorans and Graban. I always bring these three out with me. Two hang from my saddle, and I am girded with the third for fighting." After saying all this, he mounted his war-horse, which was used to trampling fiercely on anyone whom his master Fortibras had knocked down in battle. Also, on getting hold of the flasks containing the balsam, he fastened them securely onto his saddle. And then, after fastening his golden shield to his neck, he picked up his lance and, shaking it fiercely, said "Garin, I am asking you again to drink some of the balsam, as it is not a worthy venture to struggle with a wounded, almost dead man." Oliver said to him "In a while, you will be well aware that I am fit and alive."

[§40] Then Fortibras said "Garin, I beseech you, in the name of the god in whom you believe, and in the name of the baptism of your salvation, to tell me your name." To this Oliver said "Let me tell you verily that I am called Oliver, friend and comrade of Roland." And Fortibras said "By observing your behaviour, I gave this idea a lot of consideration. But I am still asking in the name of your god that you take some of the balsam so that it will not be said about me that I disgracefully annihilated half a man." Oliver said to him "For all your kingdom, I shall not do that until I acquire the balsam for myself by victory in battle. Furthermore, I beg you to convert to Jesus Christ so

that you are not damned. He justly damns someone who, having rejected his living and true god, worships false idols which do not possess the power to give assistance to their devotees."

[§41] Fortibras said to him "Do not suggest that I should reject or deny my god Mohammed. Once again, I am asking you to taste some balsam, or else I shall withdraw." And Oliver said "And I shall follow you, lashing out, because, like it or not, you will contend with me." Fortibras said to him "Since that has been so for everything else, defend yourself." Soon, apart, they brandished their spears at each other, and in the first charge, they broke them into tiny fragments. From that, after having drawn their swords, they wielded a couple of strokes.

[§42] At this point in time Emperor Charles was praying to God on behalf of his soldier while genuflecting and holding a cross aloft between his two hands. The Angel of the Lord appeared to him, saying "Oliver will triumph, but this will be with much danger and as a result of an enormous effort."

[§43] The barons of France, who were watching the battle and begging for divine assistance, became very afraid. Fortibras charged at Oliver and split his shield in half with one stroke. Oliver, not pitying himself, threw away his shield in two pieces. Then, in a rage, Fortibras struck Oliver on the top of his helmet, as a result of which the eyes of Oliver glistened. Then Oliver, furious, retaliated with such tremendous force that the two war-horses staggered. And the war-horse of Fortibras knelt down, an action which threatened catastrophe. In any case, in the conflict Oliver struck Fortibras and cut off a large part of his armour under his left arm, as far as the bare skin, which led to Fortibras riding away from the reach of Oliver.

[§44] And on seeing this, all the barons of France said "Lord Jesus, what a very sharp sword this pagan owns." Then Roland said "Now I wish I could be in the place of Oliver." Hearing this, the emperor said to Roland "You, who are common and worthless person who was poorly begotten, did not dare to go out to fight with the pagan. If I live, that will become a scandal and disgrace for you." Roland humbly replied "Lord, let it be as your words decree."

[§45] Then Fortibras, waving his sword, struck out. And after inflicting a wound, he cut off a large portion of the armour from the leg of Oliver. Blood poured swiftly out from there. Then Fortibras said "Now I can see that I shall defeat you in a short space of time. Let me ask you again to sip some balsam." Oliver, languishing a lot, said "I shall never taste it unless I acquire the flasks by defeating you."

[§46] And he said under his breath "Lord Jesus, how deeply his sword cuts. Lord Jesus, from you proceeds every victory, grant me your help."

[§47] Fortibras said "Oliver, out of habit I only really charge into battle when I see my blood springing from my body." Oliver said briefly "You will see this first, and then your enterprise will become clear." Then they attacked each other, raining blows. In this bout, Fortibras wounded Oliver in the chest, as a result of which he was weakened, and he turned pale because of his very great loss of blood. And then Fortibras shouted to his master "O Mohammed, my god in whom I confide, why do you not put him to sleep? And why have you withdrawn the strength of your power so that this enemy of yours has not yet been killed?"

[§48] Oliver, partly in despair, prayed from his heart "Lord Jesus Christ, you who wanted to be crucified for our salvation, save me now against my opponent." After saying this, he regained his spirit as if he were a rabid lion assaulting his prey, and he

gave him a horrible blow, from which he cut the cord from which the flasks with the balsam were hanging, which fell to the ground. Then the horse of Fortibras, after jumping beyond the flasks, started to run, due to ~~the force~~ of the sword-blows. But it was dragged back and prevented from moving because of the rigidity of its reins. And before it was able to turn around as far as it wanted, Oliver picked up the flasks and sipped as much from them as he wanted. Then, after drinking the balsam, he became as fit as if he had never had harm done to him.

[§49] After doing this, he threw the flasks into a river so that the pagan could not taste the balsam, as he had done previously, in the event that he might be injured in the future. Now those flasks float on the water on the celebration of the birth of John the Baptist each year, quite miraculously since they weigh a great deal as they are made of gold, and decorated with a variety of precious gems. Then Fortibras, who was grief-stricken and upset on seeing all this happening, said to Oliver "You will pay dearly for all this."

[§50] Oliver said to him "I am not dying for threats. For now I fear you less than before."

[§51] Then, in a rage, Fortibras, desirous of destroying Oliver, ~~by chance~~ struck his horse between the ears, and it died, falling down under Oliver. Oliver quickly got up and aroused himself ready to fight, like the expert and agile knight he was. And the horse of Fortibras, which was accustomed to trampling on men lying on the ground, stood peacefully, showing no signs of hostility.

[§52] Because of this, Fortibras marvelled greatly. Meanwhile the barons of France, who were watching this with their attendants, became annoyed and prepared themselves to rush upon Fortibras with all their might. But because of the prohibition

of the angel, the emperor prevented them from starting their attack. Oliver, who was standing concussed in the field, pleaded for the help of the Mother of God. Catching sight of Fortibras sitting on his horse, he said hatefully, "O Pagan King of Alexandria, consider what happened in response to your bragging. You said that if Charles or Roland or any man should come to fight against you, or if four or five of the most valiant were to come forward, you would not be afraid of them. But look, even after the your boastful arrogance, you have not exerted the totality of your power or worth on a human, but on a dumb animal, a common pack-horse. The meagreness of your worth is indicated by that. You came here to defeat me, not my horse. May God also punish you for your unchivalrous behaviour. For, as you well know, I was in a position to have dispatched your horse often enough.

[§53] Fortibras, as if confused by this, replied humbly "Oliver, I know that I have erred, and I certainly did not kill your horse willingly, but by accident. If you like, climb onto my horse to fight, and I shall place my feet on the ground in recompense. And Oliver said "That I should never do, unless I win it by a successful strategy."

[§54] Fortibras said to him "Oliver, I am very puzzled with my war-horse. Whenever I have flattened anyone before, he immediately used to trample on them, and yet when you were lying prostrate, he acted in the manner of a tame lamb." Oliver said to him "He became tame for me in the presence of the creator whose faith I do not cease to worship." Then Fortibras dismounted and struck Oliver skilfully so that his sword slid out of his hand onto the ground. And then Fortibras proclaimed joyfully "Oliver, surely now you have been beaten. Where is your sword for your protection?" Oliver wanted to pick up his sword, but with a leap Fortibras quickly positioned himself in the middle and stretched out his arm to strike him. Oliver, seized by tremendous terror, protected himself with his shield as best as he could. From that jump, Fortibras

cut away a large part from his shield along with a part of his breast-plate, so that he was lucky to escape because he could have been wounded with a fatal wound.

[§55] Now after seeing this, the barons, who were very frightened, were on the point of rushing upon the pagan when they were stopped by the advice of the emperor, following the insight, or warning, of the angel. Then Fortibras, hearing the uproar of the barons, did not stop because of it, but said to Oliver with a smile "Why do you not pick up your sword which is necessary for you to defend yourself. Look at how my god Mohammed has, by his power, fulfilled my desire. Now I have a beautiful sister, whose beauty excels that of all the women of every kingdom. Therefore I beg you to renounce your baptism and your faith, and believe in my god, and I shall give my sister to you along with the Kingdom of France and the rest of the kingdoms which will be subjected, and you will reign gloriously over all the rest of the kings.

[§56] After hearing these offers, Oliver became exceedingly indignant and replied "Why do you talk in such gauche words as if you were a man incensed? I shall never deny my god Jesus Christ, nor his mother the Blessed Virgin Mary, nor his faith which he established by proclamation and for which I am prepared to die."

[§57] Fortibras said to him "You are raging excessively with your heart unappeased. So just like an idiot, you reject the wonderful things that I am offering to you. However, I am giving you permission to pick up your sword, because a man who is lacking the arms of his defence is as powerful as a woman and no more.

[§58] Oliver said to him "Certainly your offer is a huge boon and a token of great kindness. But even if I were to believe that I could acquire kingdoms here and there by that sword, I would not pick it up unless I were to have obtained it by martial

success. For if I were to kill you with that sword, which will, I hope, happen quickly, I could be found guilty of being an ungrateful man."

[§59] Fortibras said to him "You are too high in spirit, so you will quickly die." Then Oliver, looking due to divine inspiration at the war-horse of the maddened pagan, spotted the two swords which hung at the side of the horse, and, after pouncing quickly, he grabbed one of the swords called Bapteym, a sword of wonderful splendour and decoration, with its width being that of a large palm and the length of the blade being eight feet. And charging at Fortibras like a lion charges at his prey, he waved the sword saying "O King of Alexandria, here is the seal of your death." Fortibras, on seeing this, grew red with anger, and growled "O Bapteym, how lovingly have I guarded you up to now? There was never a sword better equipped for hanging by the side of a knight than you."

[§60] Oliver said to him "I shall try your sword on you and when I have tried it, I shall hand Bapteym over to you in return for my sword." And immediately he struck the pagan under his breast, and cut off all the armour so that his bare flesh appeared. And from this blow, half a foot of the sword end up buried in the earth, after it had gone through the wound, down into the ground. As for Fortibras, that dangerous attack had so weakened his arm that he did not have the strength to retaliate. Perceiving this, Oliver quickly leapt towards his sword and picked it up. And holding it out with his arm extended, he said "Here is the end of your life. However, since I have acquired my sword as a result of combat, I shall hand yours over to you for you to re-equip yourself."

[§61] Fortibras said to him "All things inasmuch as I have offered them to you for your benefit, you have rejected indignantly. So I shall not receive the slightest thing from you. And you will die instantly."

[§62] Then they attacked each other, and with a fierce blow Fortibras made the shield of Oliver fly into the air. And he said "Why do you struggle to resist? You can see that the end of your battle is imminent." Oliver, saying nothing in reply, struck him back in such a way that their heads collided because of the force of the stroke, and it seemed as if fiery sparks were scattering from their eyes. Then after a powerful leap, Fortibras cut off the whole of the shield of Oliver, except for a small bit.

[§63] At this point Fortibras said in a rage "You will never take part in a battle again, and no friend will enjoy your company in the future, and Charles will not see you in your prime, nor will Roland. Meet the death that has been prepared for you by the goddess fortune." Now when Fortibras had stretched his arm up into the air so that he could inflict a mortal blow on Oliver, Oliver, with the help of God, from his seat caught sight of bare flesh on the right-hand side of Fortibras, without any armour. And immediately, brandishing his sword with vigour, he aimed his blow there and slashed the whole of his right side including his thigh. Then the descending sword inflicted a serious wound to his leg so that the flesh that had been cut through as far as the bone was hanging down and his entrails became visible on the outside. And his blood flowed out from the wound in great quantity. Then Fortibras, falling to the ground, piously proclaimed "Oliver, my hero, I submit myself to you, defeated by your prowess. I ask on behalf of Jesus Christ, for whose love you exposed yourself to such great danger, that you have me baptised in his name, and that, because of your excellent chivalric values, you do not kill me. Surely that would be abominable to God, and it would be turned into as a disgrace for you, if you were to kill me, a wounded man, after I have humbly admitted defeat and pledged faithful service to the Christian faith. If I manage to convalesce, I shall struggle wholeheartedly for the faith of Christ, and I shall humbly be of service to Emperor Charles as my earthly lord. And I shall hand over all the relics which I snatched from Rome. What profit or what glory would there be for you to kill me, now half dead? Spare me, I beseech, and I ask

that you, because of your noble chivalric values, place me on the horse in your presence and lead me to the emperor who could have me cured if it were possible." And he said "Oliver, I beg you to put on this breast-plate, because I sent fifty thousand of the barbarians to hide in the forest, and if they should happen to meet you, you will be able to offer them better resistance.

[§64] After hearing this, Oliver, having been moved with pity, started to cry. Then Fortibras added "Above all, take my swords with you, as I really think that there are none better than these." And Oliver laid him across the top of the horse in front of him, because he was not able to sit down.

[§65] Then suddenly a barbarian, Bruland of Momira, left his hiding-place with great speed and struck Oliver in the chest, and had it not been for the second breastplate, he would have inflicted a lethal wound on him.

[§66] Then Fortibras said "Put me in some place where the Saracens will not discover me," And Oliver lifted him carefully from the horse and gently placed him in a particular hiding-place, and he put the horse under spurs, hoping that it would go in the direction of the army of Charles in order to obtain help. And then ten thousand of the Saracens encountered him. And straightaway, praying for divine protection, he drew out Hauteclere, that is his sword, and went up to the son of the empress of the pagans, cleft him right into his chest, picked up his lance and, just like a furious lion, ran to and fro among the barbarians and forced thirty or more to descend to Tartarus. In that conflict, he killed the noble barbarian called Glaucis. After that, the pagans closed in on him from every direction.

[§67] Eventually Moradas and Turgisins, Sortibrand de Cornubia and King Margan charged ferociously towards him shouting "O Gallic Person, you will not escape this

time." But whomever he touched with his sword, he fatally wounded, and he cut down the barbarians just like a wolf does sheep or lambs. Unluckily, however, the Saracens killed his horse. And after getting himself up quickly onto his feet, he took a shield, and waved ^{Hauteceler} vigorously, so that hardly anyone dared come near him. However, the pagans were striking him with so many blows that his shield was being shattered into very small parts. And after his two breast-plates had been pierced on several occasions, they treacherously inflicted four serious, but not fatal, wounds on his body. And they seized him violently, binding him tightly, and they covered his eyes with a band so that he could not see any of them, and dishonourably they made him mount a captured horse and ordered four of the barbarians to guard him.

[§68] At this point in time, Roland arrived with his comrades from the twelve peers and they fiercely charged at the barbarians. Roland struck Corsabiles in the middle of the chest. Ogier killed Athenas. Richard killed Amangis. And after a short time, there was not one of them who had not killed a noble pagan. From there, they could have won the complete victory; But the barbarians, after regrouping into one unit, attacked the Christians and compelled them to retreat half a mile. And they killed the nobles Galies and William along with other Christian knights, and knocked down Bernard, the son of Duke Tirri, and Gymer, the noble count of Amboise, and bound them tightly. And they thrust them onto conquered pack-horses so that they could be taken to the Admiral, king of the pagans.

[§69] Seeing this, King Charles anxiously shouted his war-cry, saying "Hey, my renowned barons, it is evident so far that you are too fainthearted, from the fact that you are allowing the pagan barons to lead my counts off in captivity. So bring out your customary mettle by extracting my renowned knights from the clutches of the barbarians."

[§70] On hearing all this, the Christian soldiers with total foresight charged into the barbarians and propelled them into flight. Then Roland, on meeting the empress, cleft her down to her breast. Consequently, after many on the side of the pagans had been killed, they fled in a hurry, dragging with them the seriously wounded Oliver, Count Bernard, and Count Gylmer, all tightly bound. And the barons were not able to reach them. These are the men who were captured: Galfrid, the noble Count of Anjou, and Auber and Gerarin, and they were led off with the rest. Then Roland and the rest of the Christians chased them continually throughout that day and into the evening, but they were not able to get to within one mile of the captives. (Those captured: Oliver, Galfrid, Bernard, Auber, Gylmer, Gerarin.)

[§71] Then Charles and his men, reckoning that nightfall was imminent, finished their own battle, and returned with the army to their camp. But when he came to the place where Fortibras of Alexandria was lying, he said with a bitter heart "O Saracen, let misfortune fall upon you. For you have indeed made me lose my champions and Oliver, with whom I had a spiritual bond, and whom I loved deeply and deservedly.

[§72] Then Fortibras, lifting his head as far as he could, said to the king "Most noble Emperor, I admit that I have been defeated by Oliver, to whom, as my valiant conqueror, I have yielded myself completely. . . . I am seeking the sacrament of baptism, Noble Emperor, ^{hence} grant that I may have this benefit. I am rejecting all my gods as vile objects, and I am opening myself devotedly to my creator. I hope that, if I convalesce, I can be of such service to your majesty and can defend the laws of Christ against the barbarians in such a way that they may be converted to the praise of God and to the veneration of your magnificence. The capture of Oliver is distressing me more than the harshness of my wounds. I shall return to you all the relics that I stole from Rome. It would be a sign of most

barbarous cruelty to execute me when I am half-dead, or allow me to perish, even though I am a Saracen."

[§73] Then the emperor, feeling compassion from inside, ordered his barons to lay him gently upon his shield. Following this order, the barons immediately got ready and placed him lightly upon the shield of the king. Then they carried him like that to the *beam erected as a sign*. And as he was resting on his bed, the Gauls rushed up on all sides so that they could see him, admiring the manliness of his body, and his beauty.

[§74] Then immediately the king called Archbishop Turpin, and said "Quickly prepare the things which are needed for the sacrament of baptism. I want this king to be baptised, in accordance with his wish." Soon the noble barons were standing around. From their point of view he appeared to be dead because of the seriousness of his wounds. But the bishop gave him the name Florentin, and he now lies buried in Rome, called Saint Florentius. However, up to the time of his death, he used to use his first name, that is Fortibras. Then, after summoning two expert doctors, the emperor instructed them to find out if he could be cured. On finding his insides and entrails whole and intact, they said that he should have recovered within two months.

[§75] The pleased emperor said "God be praised! Oh, if I had Oliver and the rest of the captured barons, how I would rejoice."

[§76] Meanwhile, the Saracens quickly and impetuously led Oliver and the rest of the barons on and they crossed the bridge of Mantribil and came to the city of Egrimor, where Admiral Balant was. There Bruland of Momira, after dismounting quickly from his horse, went to King Balant. The king on meeting him said "Tell me Bruland, have you brought Emperor Charles here to me? Tell me the details of your

expedition." Bruland replied "We fared rather badly. Charles, along with his army, savagely defeated us, and killed many of our kings and dukes. And what is worse, your son Fortibras has been wounded to the point of death, and he has been made a Christian, and baptised."

[§77] Having heard this, the Admiral fell to the ground, as if he were dead. But when he had revived, he said with a heavy sigh "Oh Fortibras, my son, who is the man who triumphed over you? Alas, my god Mohammed, what crime caused my son to be defeated? He, who defeated so many and triumphed over so many powerful men. I would rather he had been flayed alive than turned into a Christian."

[§78] Then the king, sitting and sighing on his stool, blurted out these words. "Tell me Bruland, what knight was that powerful? Who overcame my invincible son Fortibras?" Bruland replied "Master, he is that defeated knight who came in here just now with the others with his eyes blindfolded." Then, in an uneasy voice, the Admiral ordered him to be brought at once into his presence, swearing by his god that he and the others would die a very nasty death.

[§79] Oliver and the others were more than just a little frightened by this. Then Oliver said to his comrades "We must not under any circumstances reveal our names to the Admiral. Because if he gets an idea of our names, there will be no way for us to escape." And then, following the order of the Admiral, he was fettered in front of the Admiral along with his comrades. Oliver, quite pale and anxious, was led on into the presence of Balant. The furious Admiral said to him "Tell me, Gaul, where are you from and what is your name?"

[§80] Oliver replied "I am the son of a very poor vassal, and my friends have been orphaned from poor folk, and I am called Garceret. And we are not overly

accomplished in exploits, because the Lord Emperor only dubbed us knights recently."

[§81] On hearing these things, the Admiral raised his voice, saying "Oh Lord Mohammed, how I have been deceived. For I thought that I had five of the more noble counts of the Emperor. But they are merely paupers, just like country folk." However, he called Barbecas his chamberlain to him, saying "Go quickly and get red-hot daggers ready for me, and have them bound tightly so that they can be stabbed without delay in front of me on the marble columns of the hall.

[§82] Barbecas replied to him "Lord, the sun is setting and our dinner, which has been prepared, will spoil. It will be a shame for us to kill them at such a time when our nobles are not here. Please, sit on your order for the time being, and let the Gauls be closely confined until sunrise tomorrow. And then, let them be subjected to the wishes of the council of our nobles."

[§83] The Admiral said to him "I am pleased by what you are saying." The guard of the prison, who was called Brutamunt, was called immediately. The Admiral said to him "It is my instruction for you, on the pain of death, that these Gauls be thrown into a confined, deep dungeon until tomorrow." And he, fulfilling the order of the king, most unpleasantly incarcerated them. Then, after returning to the king, Brutamunt said "Lord, I have done as you ordered. I have incarcerated those Gauls in a place where there is no light, and where slithering worms abound, and where a stream of sea water comes in through an aqueduct. This night will prove to be rather horrible and distressing for them."

[§84] Now the knights were standing on the floor of the prison, in the middle of the water which reached up to their chests, and they blocked the path of the water as best

they could. But more and more often, Oliver seemed to be like a dead man due to the stinging of his wounds, and he would have been submerged if Bernard and Gylmer the Scot had not supported him. By the will of God, pillars which were fifteen feet high were found, and the others lifted Oliver there, and afterwards they all climbed up and there they sat, exhausted.

[§85] Then Oliver, sighing in a mournful voice, said "Oh Reyner, my father, you will never see me again. Alas, now the spouse of my sister is shackled."

[§86] Bernard said to him "Sir, it is not fitting for a knight to moan like a woman, or to wail so. God is capable of leading us away from this, just as King Balant is of detaining us. I wish we were sitting armed upon our war-horses. Oh, how many of the barbarians would die before they could lead us to this place."

[§87] In the meantime, Floripes, the daughter of the king and sister of Fortibras, who was listening, heard their wailing. Within the ranks of womankind, there was no-one who could match her in beauty and in the elegance of her limbs and in the richness of her jewellery, and her clothes were of haute-couture. And the belt with which she was girded was of unrivalled value, because precious gems, whose qualities were magnificent and marvellous, were distributed all over it. She was dressed in a mantle that had been woven in the island of Colchis, where Jason sought the golden fleece. She came down from her palace with twelve maidens of noble birth and went into the throne-room of the king, where the barbarians were lamenting Fortibras, her brother. She quickly inquired for which nobleman such a great lament was being made. They said to her "Lady, it is for your noble brother Fortibras, who has just been killed by the Gauls. And immediately, after sighing, she let out groans so it seemed as if she were half dead. After this, an even larger lament was roused among them. Eventually, she returned to her palace, crying. And when she had finally regained her composure

after crying, she called Brutamunt, the guard of the prison, to her and said to him "Who are these knights whom you have incarcerated?" Brutamunt replied "Madam, they are Gauls from the family of Charles, who rarely cease from destroying us. And by whose help, your brother Fortibras now lies dead. There is one of them more handsome and noble than anyone I remember ever having seen."

[§88] Floripes said to him "Brutamunt, I wish you to allow me to talk to them for a short time. I shall discreetly extract from them where they are from, and who they are and the lineage from which they have come." Brutamunt replied indignantly "Madam, my master, the king, your father has ordained that no-one should talk with them. I well know the deceit and guile of women. Right now I can clearly remember, thinking of the wife of Duke Haymer, how she killed that Lausag. And after that she became a Christian and was betrothed to Haymer. There is no more sinister evil than the wickedness of a woman." Then, gravely insulted, Floripes spoke in a confident manner "You scoundrel, why do you charge me with such things, when you have been wanting for nothing?" And soon, after calling her chamberlain to her, she ordered him to bring her a stick as quickly as possible with which they could break down the door of the dungeon. On grabbing hold of the stick, she struck Brutamunt on the top of his head, and, after breaking down the door, she made him fall, decapitated and lifeless, into the depths of the dungeon.

[§89] And when he fell into the water, the knights were very frightened by the sound of his fall, believing that some devilish monster had entered the dungeon. Floripes, after having lit a candle, looked inside in the direction of one of the columns where they were sitting, and said in a soft voice "Friends, who are you? And where are you from?" Oliver replied "Madam, we are from dear France, from the family of the noble Emperor Charles. The Admiral ordered us to be thrown into this place. May

Almighty God himself free us, because we can not sustain this confinement for much longer. Indeed, death would be ~~! better~~ than this torture."

[§90] She said "I shall have you brought out of the dungeon on condition that you then grant my request and are helpful to me in the matters about which I shall tell you."

[§91] Oliver said to her "Certainly, madam, because we have never been traitors, we shall stand steadfast to the death in order to repay your kindness. If you please, madam, show us some armour and horses and I hope that we shall knock down more than a just a few barbarians, and send them in the direction of Hell." She said to him "Vassal, are you presuming to boast and threaten when you have been detained in prison up till now?" Bernard replied to her "Madam, you are well aware that many people prattle in order to forget their sorrows." Floripes said to him "I am well aware that you do not have an innocent, virginal character, and I am sure that you have frequently ensnared with lust a beautiful maiden in your bed under the covers." Gymer the Scot said to her "Madam, as far as Babylon or Alexandria, you will scarcely find his equal in those departments." To which she said "I am sure that you are a no mean fabricator of praise."

[§92] And summoning her chamberlain, she ordered him to bring her a cord of suitable length and thickness. To this, she tightly fastened a stick crosswise to it, and she lowered it like this to the knights. When the knights had caught hold of it, they straight away made Oliver sit on the stick, with him holding the cord with both his hands. Then Floripes, together with her maidens, pulled him out of the dungeon, and took him into a brightly lit room. On returning, they diligently set about drawing up the rest of the knights, whom Floripes led in a friendly manner to the aforementioned room through an ancient doorway, constructed by the barbarians. And at once she

ordered the door of the room to be locked. There was no other room with the beauty and splendour or with the reputation and decoration of this one anywhere else in the world. Because it would be too long to describe its beauty and varied decorations, we shall continue straight on. The son of Matusale had that room built. Outside one side of the room was a particular inner courtyard, which never lacked soft fruit or flowers at any time. And in that quadrangle grew Magdeglore, that is the apple which cured every disease.

[§93] With Floripes were the daughter of the king of Gloir; Clarimunda, the very beautiful daughter of another king; and Loreta, along with many other girls of noble stock. But a certain governess who was living there called Maragunda called out to Floripes and said "I am sure that I know all about these knights. This one is Oliver, the son of the most noble Count Reyner, whose daughter glitters with beauty among all the women of the Earth, she herself being the sister of Oliver who recently defeated and killed your brother Fortibras. That companion of his is Bernard, who has been highly commended for valiant deeds. The third is the noble Gylmer the Scot. The fourth is the renowned Galfrid. By my god Mohammed, I shall not taste food until I have betrayed them to the Admiral, my lord."

[§94] After she heard this, the blood of Floripes nearly froze. However, using a clever stratagem, with a shout she called the old haridan to a window. She lent herself down to her thighs out of the window when Floripes spoke. And the chamberlain, aware of the signals which Floripes had made to him and knowing what she wanted, grabbed her by the calves and threw her far out into the sea. On seeing that, Floripes chuckled, saying "Oh you old hag! You have been destroyed. The Gauls will not perish in the future because of you." And after witnessing that, the knights expressed their thanks to her.

[§95] Then she, embracing each one of them fondly, comforted them with consoling words. But when they looked at Oliver who was stained with blood, she said with deep affection "Vassal, I see that you have been wounded." Oliver said to her "Madam, I have been hurt in ^{an} particular way in my leg and in my side." She replied "I shall cure you completely right now." And she picked some fruit from Magdeglors and brought it to him. When Oliver had tasted it, he became fit and well, with no more wounds. Then Floripes ordered a well-appointed table to be laid immediately, and various edible delicacies to be placed upon it, along with many different drinks. And after supper, she had them bathed until they were clean, and then she had them made comfortable beside the fire-place.

[§96] After they had drunk their chosen beverages, Floripes said "I am well aware of who you are. I know that you are Oliver who overpowered my brother, and that you are Bernard, and that you are Gylmer the Scot. And I have freed you from your unpleasant dungeon. Now I shall reveal to you my secrets, and I ask that you assist me in my endeavours. When the Admiral, my father, destroyed Rome and violently acquired various relics, I looked around and saw a knight of France, a nephew of Charles, challenging Lucifer of Blandas, and he brilliantly knocked him down with his horse. From then on, I have loved him more than all other human men, and I am preserving my body in its virginal state for him alone, and so that I can be joined to him in holy matrimony. And as you labour diligently for the faith, I shall be a helper to you in everything, and for his love, I am pledging myself to become a Christian."

[§97] On hearing this, the barons rejoiced with great jubilation. In a grateful tone, Oliver replied "Madam, at the appropriate time and place, you must not be at all afraid that we shall not comply with you to the bitter end in order to fulfil your desire."

[§98] Then Bernard, in a lively spirit, said "Oh, if we were well armed and on our horses, how many barbarian casualties would we inflict?" Floripes said to him with a certain smile "Just now we were here in solace. Here you are, five renowned knights. Here are five noble maidens of noble stock. Any one of you may choose one of them for your pleasure and more fulfilling comfort. I shall continue to keep myself pure and virginal for the man whom my soul loves."

[§99] Now Reyner, the father of Oliver, came into the presence of Charles and, sighing heavily, said "Lord Emperor, am I to lose my valiant son, Oliver the knight? Driven by grief, I shall hasten on my way in the morning to see if I can find any information about him." And then Emperor Charles had Roland called to him. He said to him "Get yourself ready now because tomorrow morning you must go to the Admiral at Egrimor. And you will tell him to return to me intact all the relics which he plundered from Rome, together with my barons, safe and sound. Or else I shall come to him and have him hung or basely dragged behind the tails of horses." Then Duke Reyner said "Lord Emperor, that is not a good idea, because if you order him to go there, you will never see him again in the future."

[§100] And the emperor said "Since you have so preached, you will go together with him." Then Basin of Geneva said to the emperor "Lord, do you want to lose your barons without any recompense? I can well believe that if they go, they will never return."

[§101] The emperor said to him "You too will go." Then Tirri said to the emperor "Lord, consider the likely danger, because if they go, there is no hope of them returning." The emperor said to him "Likewise, you will undertake this same errand."

[§102] Then Guy, Duke of Burgundy, and Ogier the Dane, and Richard, Count of Normandy, got up and stood in front of the emperor, and spoke to the king with reverence, saying "Lord Emperor, why do you want to kill such noble knights?" The king replied to them impatiently "And you will go as well, and you will tell the Admiral to convert himself to the faith of Christ, and to render tribute to me from all the lands that he possesses, and to send the Crown of Jesus Christ to me, along with the rest of the relics which he seized when he killed the Pope at Rome, and to send my distinguished knights back to me. And if not, I shall come and take all his kingdoms from him by means of the sword. And I shall hand him over to be killed in a horrid way. And besides all this, you will take my grievances with you which you can convey to him."

[§103] And when they were ready, Duke Reyner of Velner said to the emperor "Lord, now we are all ready, give us permission to proceed. But we ask that if there is anyone whom we have offended, let him forgive us with a compassionate heart." And then Charles gave them permission along with a profound blessing.

[§104] Spurring their horses, they swiftly got under way, and crossed many lands like that. Now at the same time, the royal Admiral summoned fifteen barbarian kings. When they were standing in front of the Admiral, Moradas, the chief barbarian noble, said to the king "Lord, why have you called us into your presence?" The Admiral said to him "I want you to go to King Charles and tell him that I order him to renounce his law and to believe in Mohammed, and to return my son Fortibras, and to keep his lands in tenure from me. If not, I shall go quickly to him, and kill him in a base way. Then I shall destroy all Christendom. And on the way you are not to spare any Christian." King Moradas replied "Lord, everything will be done as you wish. When I enter France, I hope to kill ten Christians before I become exhausted."

[§105] And all the comrades said likewise, and, spurring their horses, they started their journey. And when they had travelled one day's journey from Egrimor, Duke Reyner of Velner, when he was looking ahead, saw these pagans riding vigorously. And he said to Roland "What is the mission of these barbarians?" Roland said to him "Sir, do not be rattled by them, since there are no more than twenty of them. I have considered them sufficiently." As soon as both parties had equipped themselves, Moradas spoke out with these words "Are you Christians? Let disharmony fall over you!" Reyner said to him "Vassal, you ^{should} ^{less} speak [^] cruelly. We are messengers from the noble lord Emperor Charles to the Admiral, King of the Saracens." Moradas said to him "Would you like to defend yourselves?" And Duke Reyner replied "We shall defend ourselves with divine assistance." And Moradas said "Which one of you will come to challenge me?" And Duke Reyner said "I shall challenge you with my soul willing." And Moradas said "You are speaking with stupidity, because if five such men and you were to challenge me, I would overthrow them in a humiliating fashion." And he said to his friends "Do not move. I shall defeat those Christians, and I shall present them to the Admiral, conquered."

[§106] Now when Roland had heard all this, he said to Moradas in an extremely irritated tone, "You are so stupid, and your ill-considered calculations are foolishly exciting you, as indeed is your boasting of unsubstantiated glory. Defend yourself because I am going to cut you up horribly!" Then they spurred their horses and, after charging with lances which shattered immediately, drew their swords and rained powerful blows. Eventually, Roland, boiling with fury, laid Moradas out dead on the ground. On seeing that, the rest of the pagans grew ~~wary~~ ^{and} said to each other "Let us fight like stout warriors to avenge him." And like madmen, they started fighting with the Christians. There was some doubt at the beginning of the battle as to which of the two sides would prevail. But with God helping, all the pagans were killed, except for one who alone escaped by running away quickly. And he did not stop until he reached

the city of Egrimor. And without delay, he announced himself to the Admiral. The lord Admiral straight away asked him "My lord king, how did you get on with the task?" Sighing, he said, "Master, divine fortune did not serve us well. For seven rascals who are from the family of Charles and were being sent to you as messengers encountered us. And then they killed all the kings except for me alone, I who barely escaped." When the Admiral had heard these things, he was sorely distressed, and filled with fury.

[§107] Now Roland and the other knights dismounted from the horses and rested under a particular tree. They had been extremely fatigued by the conflict. Then Duke Reyner said "It is clear that we should return and tell our lord the emperor about our mission, as nobody could then reproach us."

[§108] Roland soon replied to him "Lord Duke, I do not like anything about your words. I vow to my God that I shall never return until after the time when I have presented myself along with these captives to the Admiral and I have announced the message of the emperor to him." Duke Reyner said to him "If you do this, there will be no hope of your escaping." Count Tirri, replying in a loud voice, stated "To be sure, Roland has spoken well."

[§109] At those words they all got up and, carrying the heads with them, started travelling towards Mantribil with Duke Reyner in the lead. And when they had reached Mantribil, Duke Reyner said "Look, here is the city of Egrimor where we must go." Ogier said in reply "First we must cross the bridge of Mantribil, where there are thirty arches of marble and twenty turrets of stone; and in each turret, there are twenty men-at-arms. And the surrounding wall rises to a height of thirty cubits. And in width, it is wide enough for twenty soldiers to walk abreast. Then there are fifteen powerful men assigned to lower the bridge. A golden eagle, which glitters with

a marvellous sheen, has been placed at the top. The dreadful river called the Tagus with its furious current flows down from beyond at a distance of fifteen feet from the ground. And no boat nor curragh nor ship of any kind can sail up it due to its ferocity. And the principal guard of the bridge is a very strong and horrible giant."

[§110] They were all very frightened and said with a sigh "Alas, how can we escape all these dangers in crossing?" But Roland said, comforting them "Let us not be afraid of anything. For with the help of God, I shall liberate you from the porter." Duke Reyner said to him "You will only need to give one blow in order to receive twenty. Let us proceed craftily towards that which we have to do. Let us defeat them by means of lies and false compliments." At these words, they went immediately to the bridge. When the principal gate-keeper saw them, he instructed a hundred armed men all wearing the same emblem to lower the bridge to the ground. After the bridge had been lowered, Duke Reyner immediately walked onto the bridge with the others following him. The doorman asked them "Where are you aiming to travel to, and where are you from, and where have you come from?" Duke Reyner replied to him "We are the messengers from the noble Emperor Charles to the Admiral, he who is the supremely wicked protector of this state. And look, when we were coming to discuss our business from the emperor with him, fifteen rascals, who were striving to steal our war-horses from us, challenged us. With the help of God, we defeated them, and we have brought their heads here with us."

[§111] On seeing and hearing that, the doorman was incredibly disturbed, and he choked. But when he had finally caught his breath, he said to the duke "Before you cross the bridge, you must hand over to me the fixed toll of the bridge. Now the toll is as follows: You must first hand over thirty greyhounds in matching pairs; twenty maidens, both beautiful and chaste; thirty falcons which fly well; twenty palfreys, and just as many red war-horses; and four pack-horse loads of gold and silver. This is the

toll for every great lord entering the city across this bridge. And anyone who can not deliver these goods leaves his head behind in place of the toll."

[§112] To this Duke Reyner replied in a soft voice "Sir, there are one hundred maidens for you to look at. And when they have come, choose the ones you like the most. There are many varied and precious things on our palfreys for you to look at. Everything is yours, for your own joy." The porter said to this "I like these things." And after the chains had been untied, they lowered the bridge to the ground, and they all went onto it. Then Roland smiled, saying to the duke "You gained us entry with sufficiently suitable and deceitful blandishment." Then Roland, who kept himself at the rear, spied a single Saracen noble and charged at him, and, after grabbing him by the legs, threw him into the water. When Duke Reyner saw that, he said to Roland "May a hundred demons torment you. For by your fury, you will cause us all to be killed."

[§113] Among other people, they went through the larger door of the city of Egrimor. Looking around, they saw everywhere depictions of the birds and horses and of the animals of the world. Eventually they met a particular barbarian from whom they asked the whereabouts of the Admiral. He indicated that the Admiral was reposing under a certain tree. And without stopping, they positioned themselves in the presence of the Admiral.

[§114] Now Duke Reyner, by means of these words, was the first to relate his business to the Admiral. "May the Lord who saves those trusting in him save Emperor Charles, and may he bring distress to the Admiral, King of the Saracens, who maintains evil throughout his kingdom. Fifteen scoundrels, who strove to take our horses away from us, challenged us in the plain beyond Mantribil. But thanks to the Lord God of glory, they fared badly. We have brought their heads back to you."

[§115] On seeing that, the Admiral was very upset. And then the one who had escaped said to the Admiral "Lord, you should avenge our kings, who now lie dead. These rogues murdered them." And the Admiral said to them "Why have you come here? Inform me of your business." Then Duke Reyner said "Listen and hear the command of Charles, the noble Emperor. Through us he is demanding that you return to him the Crown of the Lord which you snatched away at Rome, along with the rest of the relics of the saints. And if you do not, he will have you hung on a scaffold like the basest criminal. He also demands that you send him back his knights, without ransom. If not, you will have a cord put around your neck like a dog, so that you can be dragged like that to the scaffold through muddy and stinking places."

[§116] On hearing that the Admiral said with fury "You have insulted me most abusively. I shall never eat again until you have paid the penalty." Then Richard, Duke of Normandy said "Emperor Charles commands that you send him the Crown of Jesus with the relics and with his soldiers, without ransom. And if you do not, you will be torn apart limb from limb." Then Tirri Duke of Ardennes spoke in a frightening expression, frowning with his eyebrows. After the Admiral had looked at him, a shiver went through him, and he said "By my god Mohammed, this man is a foremost devil." Tirri said "You are to send the relics along with the knights, safe and sound, to the Lord Emperor at once. Otherwise, you will be hung most basely." Admiral Balant said to him "Tell me honestly, if I were in your power just like you are in mine, what would you do to me?"

[§117] And Tirri said "I would hang you on a high scaffold." Balant said to him "This will definitely be the judgement on you." Ogier the Dane said these same things to the Admiral, and then Roland spoke using these words "Charles, the noble Emperor, insists that you leave your pagan religion and convert to the faith of Christianity, and that you quickly send him the relics along with the soldiers. Otherwise, he will have

you hung with enormous humiliation." Guy, Duke of Burgundy expressed the same thing. Soon the Admiral had Sortibrand, King of Coimbra, summoned along with the other kings, dukes and barons, and he asked advice from them as to what he should be doing with these messengers. Sortibrand replied first "Lord, let them be torn limb from limb. After this is done, completely re-group your army so we can look for that Emperor Charles. And when he has been captured, let him be condemned to a horrible death. Then you will be crowned at Saint Denis." The Admiral said to him "Your advice is reasonable, and so it will be done."

[§118] Now Floripes, the daughter of the Admiral, the king, and sister of the now converted Fortibras, heard the people making a noise in the throne room. So she went down and presented herself to her father, saying "My father, who are these knights who are standing in front of you?" And the Admiral said "Daughter, these are Gauls from the family of Charles, who have just been raining horrible insults upon me. Daughter, give me some advice as to what should be done with them." And she said "Let them be torn limb from limb." And the Admiral said "You are speaking well. Because you offer good advice, so it will be done. Let those knights who are in prison be brought out at once so that they can die by means of a similar punishment." And Floripes said "Lord, a lot of time has passed since it was time to eat. Your meal has been prepared, and if you tarry any longer, it will spoil. You may commit them to my care in the meantime, and I shall guard them carefully. And after lunch, let their sentence be carried out, in accordance with your wishes." Her father said to her "You speak very well. So let it be done."

[§119] Sortibrand blurted out these words in front of the king "Lord King, are you proposing to put your faith in a woman? You should recall Duke Milo who reared Galafer so lovingly, and how she deceived him and had her very beautiful daughter called Marsilion disinherited by fraud and guile."

[§120] Now Floripes, on hearing this, exclaimed in the manner of a mad woman "Tell us, false traitor, what evil or treason have you seen in me for you to impose the malice of other women onto me? If it were not for reverence to my lord, I would smash your putrid teeth with my fist." Her father said to her "Daughter, let us quit all this. It will be done as you see fit."

[§121] Then, after she had turned to the knights, said, ^{she} as if she were impatient with them "Vassals, go upstairs for the time being." And Duke Reyner said "Has anyone ever seen so beautiful a woman? Whoever could acquire her favour would be able to be very happy." And Roland said "I have never seen so elegant a lady. But what devil is causing you to think about women now? Say nothing, because your hair is turning grey." And Reyner said "I am a knight, and it is proper for a knight to say such things." And Floripes, on hearing this, said with a smile "Ignore all this, because I have not led you here for any trouble, but for mutual comfort."

[§122] Then, after entering the room, Roland saw Oliver, and ran over with great speed and embraced him. The number of embraces that they had, and the amount of joy that was in their hearts, I am not able not say. Then Floripes said in these words "Friends and knights, I ask that you support and assist me in the fulfilment of my desires, and I shall be your helper and defender in the execution of all your business." Duke Reyner said to her, "We shall be your helpers without deceit or guile as long as you defend us against our pursuers." She said to him "What is your name?" And he said "I am called Duke Reyner." Then she said to Roland "And what are you called?" "Madam, I am called Roland, the son of Milo of England and son of the sister of the Lord Charles, the Emperor." She said to him "You are worthy of reverence in everything."

[§123] Then she fell to his feet. And sighing very deeply, she said "And now I shall reveal the secrets of my heart. I have loved a knight called Guy of Burgundy more than all the others in the world, and I still love him. For his love I shall be baptised, if he is willing to be joined to me in holy matrimony." Roland said to her "You can see him, he is standing not more than a distance of two feet from you." Floripes replied "I beseech and beg that you present him to me." And after summoning Duke Guy, Roland at once said "Take this woman to be your wife." And Guy said "I certainly do not propose to take any wife for myself without the consent and assent of my Lord Charles." She said to him "Are you not aware that you are in my command? You can easily see that your safety and ruin are in my hands. Do you want to destroy yourselves for nothing?" And Roland said to Guy in a whisper "Where have you ever seen a more elegant or shapely woman, or a woman more polished in manners? Since she is of royal and noble birth, you will not find another like her anywhere else on earth. And Charles will be very pleased if you do this." At these words Duke Guy embraced her. And he gave her a pledge as an assurance to his betrothed. Floripes, quivering with considerable joy, said "Let God be praised, for the reason that he gave me that which I have always loved and desired from the deepest depths of my womanhood." And she embraced Guy with tears of happiness.

[§124] And soon Floripes brought out a precious golden cloth, and she stretched it out both crosswise and lengthwise. And going back to her [.....], she brought out the Crown of Christ along with the rest of the relics of the saints, and she placed them on the cloth, saying to Roland "Sir, this is the crown with which Christ was crowned. And here are the relics of the saints which you so greatly desire."

[§125] On seeing these things, the knights humbly prostrated themselves on the ground and worshipped them with devotion.

[§126] Meanwhile, one pagan, Lucufer de Bandas, went up and greeted the Admiral who was sitting at table, asking whether or not Fortibras had now come back. He replied "No, but seven messengers came from the camp of Charles and insulted me horribly. I have committed them to the care of Floripes, my daughter."

[§127] Lucufer said to him "You have acted rather foolishly by committing them to the care of any woman whatsoever. For the soul of a woman is easy to corrupt. Lord, if you like, I shall leave your presence to see how these messengers are." The Admiral said to him "Go with the blessing of Mohammed." And Lucufer, trusting in his friendship with the king and in his own courage, went up to the room where the knights were chatting together. And on arrival, he struck the door of the room with his foot so that it flew into the air of the room. On seeing that, Floripes trembled with fear. And calling Roland to her, she asked him to protect her from ^a peasant such as he who had been overly and excessively violent. And she said "This is the man who is plotting maliciously against us."

[§128] At these words, Roland charged. Duke Reyner took hold of the pagan by the throat. But the pagan squeezed the throat of the duke so hard that he almost laid him out on the floor. And he said to the duke "Where are you from, old man?" And the duke said "I am from France. I am called Reyner. I beseech you to take your hands off my throat." The pagan said to him "With pleasure, because I am going to spare you." And the pagan said to the duke "Do you know what sort of games are played in our parts of the world?" The duke replied "We have not heard anything about them in Gaul." And the pagan said "Old man, I shall teach you."

[§129] And he leant over and picked up a burning torch, and he blew on it with such great force that sparks were scattered throughout the whole room. Then, on handing

the torch to the duke, he said "Old man, now it is your turn to blow." Then the duke blew on it so fiercely that the sparks set fire to his beard and eyebrows.

[§130] And he struck the pagan with the torch on the head, as a result of which his two eyes popped out. And he said "You did not know how to play the game well. So I showed you." And Roland said "Let your arm which showed him such a game so well prevail."

[§131] Then Floripes, quivering with great joy, said "He can now look for a wife for himself. This man flattered my father night and day, promising him a great number of gifts so that he could take me to be his wife. But let the man who freed me from him be decorated." And after a short time, Floripes said to them "Now we must be careful. For the Admiral loved this man more than all other mortal souls, and he may come with his army to avenge him, and he may besiege you trapped inside the tower. And there will be no stratagem for escaping. Now since they are still at the dining tables, greedily engaged in eating their food, arm yourselves without pausing for anything in the way in which knights should be armed, and go down into the palace of the king and cut them up, sparing none of them from the oldest to the youngest." Following the decree of Floripes, they armed themselves, went down in the appropriate way to the palace of the king with Roland in front, and they cut up the pagans just as wolves devour lambs.

[§132] For their part the pagans fled, leaving their victuals and their tables, and some were killed in the stampede. Others broke their legs after jumping through the windows. Others were drowned in the water. Others were handed over to a miserable fate.

[§133] In this skirmish, Oliver killed the noble king called Coldref. And the Admiral fled valiantly, with Roland chasing after him. And he stretched out his arm with his sword to strike the Admiral just as he was jumping into a particular ditch. Without making contact, he drove his sword half a foot into a marble rock. And they killed so many of the barbarians, it was horrible to watch. They completely took charge of the palace after the towers had been emptied of barbarians. Then they took control of the chains of the bridge and their mechanisms.

[§134] Now Sortibrand, on finding the king in the ditch, pulled him out and said "Lord, did I not warn you to guard against the malice of women." The king said to him "I am suitably humiliated. It is not right to chide me just now. Now tomorrow, I shall muster my army so that the tower can be razed to the ground, and all those scoundrels can be burnt along with my daughter Floripes." With night drawing in, they all looked for a place to sleep. When dawn broke on the following day, the Admiral gathered his troops in such great numbers that the tents of the pagans could be seen stretching for four leagues.

[§135] The Admiral called Malpin of Egrimor, a robber, to whom nobody on Earth was equal in the art of robbery, and said to him "Go and steal stealthily the girdle of my daughter Floripes, as it is hardly practical to besiege the tower, since no-one in that place will suffer from hunger if he looks at the girdle." In response, Malpin said "By my life, I shall present the girdle to you tomorrow."

[§136] Arriving by night, Malpin, after he had swum across the water, immediately scaled the wall of the tower like a squirrel. He found the door to the room where Floripes was lying with her maidens shut. So he uttered a charm so that, once it had been said, the door opened in an instant. And after lighting a particular candle that he had brought with him, he went over to the bed of Floripes where he uttered another

charm to seal her in her sleep, and then diligently searched for the girdle. At last he found Floripes, girded with the girdle, which he removed from her in silence and tied it around himself. However, desiring to rape her, he took hold of her by the legs. But she awoke from her deep sleep and shouted "Oh damsels, you are sleeping too soundly. Oh, renowned knights, you are too far away right now."

[§137] Guy of Burgundy was standing looking at the army of the pagans. On hearing the cry of Floripes, he leapt in with his sword drawn, and seeing him, he sliced him through and immediately threw him into the water. From then on, he did not know how to manufacture charms. (The light was shining very brightly indeed, so that it appeared that many more people, on seeing him, had fled out of fear.) Then Floripes, sighing, said "Alas, now I have lost my girdle that was more precious than gold, in fact than all the treasure of the world. From now on we must obtain foodstuffs in a way that would not have been necessary if we had the girdle." And she told the tale of the robber to the surrounding knights.

[§138] When dawn was breaking, the Admiral called Bruland de Munnifre, Sortibrand and the rest of the kings and dukes to him to advise him, saying "I am certain that Malpin my robber has been killed. Therefore I want some sound advice on these matters as to what should be done about the tower." In reply, Sortibrand said "Lord, let there be an uproar of horns and trumpets, and let your army make vicious attacks with battering rams and various engines so that they can destroy the tower." And the king said "Let it be done just like it has been said." At these words, the king along with all his army prepared themselves to destroy the tower.

[§139] Floripes, considering the serious lack of foodstuffs which had come about, fell into a death-like swoon. Guy comforted her with very soothing words. Then Guy proclaimed in front of them all "We have been seriously trapped here by the

barbarians, and we have enough victuals for only eight days. It is a necessity that we obtain food for ourselves, as it is more important for us to die with honour than to live with splendour. Now the maidens will die of hunger. But I would prefer to suffer death first. Let us cry aloud and acquire victuals by means of divine intervention."

[§140] Then Floripes quickly suggested these measures. "Aha! How powerful is this god in whom we previously believed?" And after she had said this, she took them through a small, ancient doorway into the synagogue of the barbarians where their gods made of very precious gold, that is Margoth, Ternegant, Iuipin and Apolin, and many other golden images had been placed, along with varied perfumes and jewels and other very precious baubles. After seeing them, Floripes said to the barons "Humble yourselves to these gods and worship them, praying for their blessing." And Guy threw down and smashed Iuipin. Ogier smashed Margoth to smithereens. Then Roland broke into speech and said to Floripes "To be sure, these gods are less powerful, because after they have been smashed to pieces on the floor, they can not raise themselves and get up."

[§141] Floripes said to him "It is clear that there would be trouble for me if I were to adore any of them from now on."

[§142] From there, they went down to the stables where the more renowned war-horses of the king were housed. Immediately, when they had been suitably armed, they chose the more distinguished horses. After mounting them, they came to the way out. And Roland said to Tirri of Ardennes "Guard the door so that the pagans do not get in and overwhelm us." Tirri said to him "What fickleness or timidity have you seen in me? Why should I be put in such a place where I can not pursue the enemies of Christ?" Roland said to him "You will take Richard Duke of Normandy with you for your peace of mind, and ours. And should the barbarians come and occupy the

door, there will be no way for us to escape because we shall not be able to cross the bridge of Mantribil due to the great strength of the barbarians, nor cross the water of the Tagus because of the violent speed of the current; Therefore it is necessary that the door be guarded for our needs."

[§143] Now the Admiral, on looking around outside his palace and seeing them riding, exclaimed in a loud voice "Aha! Look, I can see those Gallic barons riding quickly without their standards raised at the front. And should they escape, they will cause us no small problem."

[§144] Then he had his war-cry raised. On hearing this, all the barbarians girded themselves with arms and followed on valiantly. Roland, together with the others, on seeing all this, took up a stand with a view to defence and quickly killed all whom they met in the first onslaught.

[§145] King Clarion, the nephew of the Admiral and one of the more valiant pagans, went to meet them, accompanied by fifteen soldiers. Then Roland, after meeting King Geimper, split him open down to the belt with one blow of his sword called Durendal. Guy, seeing that Clarion was moving at great speed, headed straight for him. The pagan, firing an arrow at him, killed the horse of Guy.

APPENDICES

The manuscripts of the *Chanson de Fierabras* and its derivative versions provide concrete evidence for the interest in the Fierabras story in later Medieval Europe. It has been shown earlier how the date of the manuscripts can suggest how the Fierabras story was being interpreted, and why its copying at a certain time may have had a political significance¹. In the discussion of the manuscripts, only a certain selection of examples were taken for examination. It is the purpose here to provide a list of all the extant medieval manuscripts and early printed editions, so an overview of their historical distribution can be obtained².

As was discussed in Part One, the *Chanson de Fierabras* and its derivative versions are often preceded by a prologue, and followed by an epilogue. The most distinctive prologue is perhaps *La Destruction de Rome*. These prologues and/or epilogues give each manuscript copy of the Fierabras story its particular character. The list shows how the prologue and epilogues accompany the texts of the Fierabras story in each manuscript. The list also illustrates the more significant texts that was being read alongside the Fierabras story, such as other chansons de geste.

¹ See Part One, Chapter 2.

² This list reproduces in a different order the summary list given by A. de Mandach in *Naissance et Développement de la Chanson de Geste en Europe* vol.5, Geneva, 1987, pp.165-7.

Manuscripts containing the *Chanson de Fierabras* and associated French verse texts³

French Verse - *Chanson de Fierabras*

Thirteenth Century

MS. Anc. Louvain, Bib. de l'Université, G 171, fol. 52-126.

This manuscript was written 1240-1300 in the Anglo-Norman dialect. A complete copy of the *Chanson de Fierabras* follows *Boeue de Hamtun*.

MS. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Cabinet of MSS, unknown leaf.

A fragment contained on a thirteenth-century leaf written in Francien script.

MS. Biblioteca del Escorial, M-11-21, fol. 33-96.

A manuscript of the thirteenth century written in Picard script, containing the majority of the text.

MS. Metz, Bib. municipal, frag., unknown leaf.

A thirteenth-century fragment.

MS. Brussels, Bib. Royal, IV. 852, no.9.

A thirteenth-century fragment.

³Folio or Page references show the position of the Fierabras story itself in the manuscript and not the prologues or epilogues.

Fourteenth Century

MS. Vatican, Regina Christina 1616, fol. 21-92.

This manuscript was copied in 1317 at Saint-Brieuc in Brittany. The *Chanson de Fierabras* is followed by a copy of the *Chanson d'Otinél*.

MS. Hannover, Niedersächsische Staatsbibliothek, IV. 578, fol. 55a-100d.

The *Chanson de Fierabras* was added to this manuscript written in the Anglo-Norman dialect during the first half of the fourteenth century. The text is preceded by *La Destruction de Rome*, which had been copied previously during the thirteenth century.

MS. Paris, B.N. fr.12603, fol. 239-78.

The manuscript was written during the fourteenth century in a Picard Script. The *Chanson de Fierabras* is followed by a copy of the *Chanson d'Ogier de Danemarche*.

MS. St Strasbourg, Bib. de l'Université, unknown leaf.

A fourteenth-century fragment.

MS. Mons, Bib. de l'Université d'Etat.

A fourteenth-century fragment.

Fifteenth Century

MS. B.L. Royal 15 E VI, fol. 70-85.

This manuscript was commissioned by John Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, and compiled between 1444-6 as a gift for the marriage of Marguerite of Anjou to Henry VI of England. The part of the manuscript containing the *Chanson de Fierabras* was probably written at Mons under Jean Wauquelin. Also present in the manuscript is a copy of the *Chanson d'Aspremont*.

MS. Paris, B.N. fr.1499.

This manuscript was written between 1450 and 1465, during the reign of Duke Philip 'the Good', in a Bastard Burgundian style.

Occitan Verse

Thirteenth Century

MS. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Gall. Oct. 41.

This manuscript, of which the script indicates the probable date of writing as before the middle of the thirteenth century, contains a text which fuses *La Destruction de Rome* and the *Chanson de Fierabras* into one narrative account in the Occitan dialect.

Anglo-Norman Verse

Fourteenth Century

MS. B.L. Egerton 3028, fol.84-118.

Dated to the middle of the fourteenth century, this manuscript contains a unique, abbreviated version of *La Destruction de Rome* followed by a unique, abbreviated version of the *Chanson de Fierabras*..

Manuscripts containing French Prose Adaptations

Roman de Fierabras

Fifteenth Century

MS. B.N. fr. 4969.

Written about 1410, based on palaeographical evidence, the text is a Middle French prose adaptation of the *Chanson de Fierabras* prefaced by a short rendering of *La Destruction de Rome*.

MS. B.N. fr 2172.

By the script, this manuscript is dated to around 1460 and only contains a copy of the *Roman de Fierabras*.

Chroniques et Conquêtes de Charlemagne

Fifteenth Century

MS. Brussels, B.R. 9067, fol. 14-90.

This manuscript was finished in 1458 by David Aubert under commission from Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy. The complete text is a vast compilation of chansons de geste and Latin histories concerning Charlemagne, all redacted into French prose, which could provide a complete history of the wars of the emperor against the infidel.

The *Fierabras* of Jehan Bagnyon

Fifteenth Century

MS. Geneva, Bibl. Publique et Universitaire, fr. 188.

The earliest manuscript of the *Fierabras* written by Savoyard Jehan Bagnyon in Lausanne around 1478. The text makes a centrepiece out of its prose adaptation of the *Chanson de Fierabras*. For a prologue, there is a brief history of the Kings of France before Charlemagne, and a version of the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus....* . The *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* serves as the epilogue. The material from the prologue and epilogue are drawn from the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais.

MS. Cologny-Geneva, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, fr. 16.

Also written around 1478, this manuscript contains the text of Jean Bagnyon, slightly reordered.

Manuscripts containing English Verse Translations

Sir Firumbras

Fourteenth Century

MS. Bod. 25166-7, formerly Ashmole 33.

This manuscript was written between 1357 and 1377 in the diocese of Exeter. The manuscript is presumed to be of clerical authorship as it is bound using documents relating to the management of the diocese. The text of *Sir Firumbras* is the only item; the pages containing the start and end of the text are missing.

Sowdon of Babylon

Fifteenth Century

MS. Princeton, Firestone Lib., Garrett Coll. Ms. 140, fol. 41-81.

This manuscript was written around the year 1450. It contains a text in the East Midlands dialect which is a fusion of the Anglo-Norman versions of the *Chanson de Fierabras* and *La Destruction de Rome*..

Fillingham Firumbras

Fifteenth Century

MS. B.L., Add. 37492, fol. 1a-30a.

This manuscript is dated to the last quarter of the fifteenth century. The *Fillingham Firumbras* is followed in the manuscript by *Otuel and Roland*, a combined adaptation of the *Roman d'Otinel* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*.

Manuscripts of the Irish Tradition

Gesta Karoli Magni

Fifteenth Century

MS. T.C.D. 667, pp. 85-100.

The manuscript is dated 1455, and contains the half complete Latin text *Gesta Karoli Magni*, edited in this project. The Franciscan friary at Ennis, County Clare is the most likely place of writing due to the ecclesiastical and devotional character of the texts and the number of references made to this region in the manuscript. The manuscript also contains *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis* and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*,

although the quire containing the fragmentary *Gesta Karoli Magni*, seemingly one of two similar quires in origin, is not in the same hand, or possess the exactly the same codicological features as the quires containing these other texts.

Sdair Fortibrais

In the Irish manuscripts, *Sdair Fortibrais*, the translation of *Gesta Karoli Magni*, is always preceded by a copy of a translation of *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*.

Fifteenth Century

MS. R.I.A. 23 o 48, 'Liber Flavus Fergusiorum', fol. 2a-10a.

An incomplete copy of *Sdair Fortibrais* is contained in this manuscript which is dated 1437 and was written in the neighbourhood of County Roscommon; the Upper Shannon region is notable for manuscript production around 1400. The manuscript contains primarily ecclesiastical and devotional material.

MS. Bod., Laud 610, fol. 45a-56b.

An East Munster manuscript, commissioned in 1454 by Edmund Butler as a memorial to his uncle, James Butler, the 'White Earl' of Ormond. The manuscript incorporates a manuscript written for the White Earl, and it contains much Irish narrative literature such as *Féilire Oengusso* and *Acallam na Senórach* in addition to *Sdair Fortibrais*.

MS. T.C.D. H.2.12 No.3.

This extract is the third part of a larger binding. It contains *Sdair Fortibrais* followed by *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir*. The date of writing of the manuscript is given as 1475; the scribe names himself as Teig O Riordain.

MS. B.L. Egerton 1781, fol. 2-18.

This manuscript was written in 1484 at the house of Niall O Siaghail in County Offaly. *Sdair Fortibrais* is followed by *Gabháltas Šerluis Mhóir*, both of which are complete. This volume comprises a large collection of chiefly ecclesiastical material, including a prose paraphrase of biblical and church history.

MS. R.I.A. 24 P 25, 'Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne', fol.2-14⁴.

This manuscript was written 1513-14 on Tory Island by Cithrud Mac Findgaill for Máire, wife of Mac Suibhne Fanad. Similar to the Liber Flavus Fergusiorum, it is principally a collection of religious and ecclesiastical material.

MS. T.C.D. H.2.7, pp. 435b-56.

This manuscript is a fifteenth-century manuscript of narrative literature, containing a number of translations of 'Matter' romances, including *Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás*, *Gyi de Bharbhuic* and *Bibhus de Hamtun*. The scribe of the manuscript was Uilliam Mac an Leagha, active during the second half of the fifteenth century.

MS. T.C.D. H.2.17.

This manuscript is a fifteenth-century compilation of a number of manuscript fragments containing narrative literature, including an incomplete copy of *Sdair Fortibrais*.

MS. King's Inns, No. 10, fol. 1ff.

Probably dating from the late fifteenth century, this manuscript contains both *Sdair Fortibrais* and *Gabháltas Šerluis Mhóir* among other texts of ecclesiastical interest.

⁴De Mandach, *op.cit.*, p.173; de Mandach does not acknowledge the existence of this manuscript.

Early Printed Editions of Fierabras Adaptations and Translations

French Prose - *Fierabras*

This is the text of Jean Bagnyon, of which a number of printed editions were made in Geneva and Lyon during the later fifteenth century. Between 1478 and 1488, four editions were printed in Geneva. Between 1484 and 1497, five such editions were printed in Lyon. Editions of this text continued to be printed in large numbers during the sixteenth century.

English Prose - *Charles the Great*

This text is a very close English translation of the *Fierabras* of Jean Bagnyon by William Caxton. The edition was prepared by Caxton in 1485 for the printing press at Westminster.

Spanish Prose - *Hystoria del Emperador Carlo Magno y de los Doze Pares de Francia*

The other translation of the *Fierabras* of Jean Bagnyon made for the printing press was done into Spanish by Nicolas de Piemonte. Two editions were made by Jacobo Cromberger at Seville during the early sixteenth century, the first in 1521, the second in 1528. The publication was taken to Latin America, where it became the source of a number of versions of the Fierabras story, both oral and literary.

APPENDIX TWO**THE NAMES OF *GESTA KAROLI MAGNI* AND
SDAIR FORTIBRAIS, AND THEIR EQUIVALENTS
IN FRENCH AND ENGLISH FIERABRAS TEXTS**

Material from this appendix has previously been employed to demonstrate that *Gesta Karoli Magni* is translated from the standard French version of the *Chanson de Fierabras* and not from the extant Anglo-Norman version, or any of the other derivative texts¹. The examples selected for use were those that in themselves illustrate that the French poem was used as a source. However, in order to be able to select these examples, a complete study of the names in *Gesta Karoli Magni* and *Sdair Fortibrais* was required, and their comparison with the forms of the name in the other texts containing the Fierabras story. The full results of this study are presented in the list below. As well as placing the examples used previously in context, this list will show that many of the names are common to most texts, and that there are no other particularly distinctive processes at work in the shaping of the Irish tradition².

The abbreviations (and editions) are the same as those used before:-

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| L: <i>Gesta Karoli Magni</i> | (These names are listed first here.) |
| I: <i>Sdair Fortibrais</i> | |
| F: <i>Chanson de Fierabras</i> | (These names follow the Irish tradition.) |
| AN: The Anglo-Norman text | |
| Fp: the French prose adaptation | |
| DA: The text of David Aubert | |
| FM: <i>Sir Ferumbras</i> | |
| FF: The Fillinghan <i>Firumbras</i> | (Many names missing due to lacunae) |
| SD: <i>Sowdon of Babylon</i> | |
| CG: <i>Charles the Great</i> | |

¹ This material is used in Part One, Chapter Four, Section Two.

² i.e. it will show also that the examples used in Part One, Chapter Four, Section Two are not selected with a bias to prove a French poetic source.

The Christians

L	Helena
I	Elena
F	-
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

L	Constantinus
I	Constantinus
F	-
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

L	Karolus
I	Serlus
F	Karles
AN	Charls
Fp	Charlez
DA	Charles
FM	Charlis
FF	Charlys
SD	Charles
CG	Charles

L	Rolandus	
I	Rolandus	
F	Rollans	
AN	Rollant	
Fp	Rollant/d	
DA	Rollant/d	
FM	Roland	
FF	Rouland	
SD	Rouland	(Associated placenames
CG	Rolland (Cenonia)	are bracketed in this list)

L	Oliverus
I	Oliverus
F	Oliviers
AN	Oliver
Fp	Oliv(i)er
DA	Olivier (Vienne)
FM	Oliver
FF	Oliver
SD	Olyver
CG	Olyver

L	Ricardus (Normannia)
I	Roisderd (Normaine)
F	Richars (Normendie)
AN	Richard (Normundie)
Fp	Richard (Normandie)
DA	Richart (Normandie)
FM	Richard (Normandy)
FF	Richard (Normandye)
SD	Richard (Normandy)
CG	Rychard (Normandye)

L	Ogerus Le Deneuis
I	Ogerus Ledainnsedh
F	Ogiers li Danois
AN	Ogier li Daneis
Fp	Ogier (Danemarche)

DA	Ogier (Dannemarche)
FM	Oger the Deneys
FF	Oger Danys
SD	Oger Danoys
CG	Ogyer Danois (Denmarke)

L	R/Neymerus (Geniove)
I	Nemerus(Egne)
F	Reniers (Gennes)
AN	-
Fp	Reynier/z (Gennez)
DA	Re(y)nier (Gennes)
FM	Reyner (Genyue)
FF	Reynere (Grane)
SD	-
CG	Reyner (Gennes)

L	Garinus
I	Garrinus
F	Garins
AN	Garins
Fp	-
DA	Guarin
FM	Garyn
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Garin

L	Ferrant (Hyspania)
I	-
F	Ferrans (Espagne)
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Ferrant
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Ferraunt

L	Gindeleon
I	Gentelion
F	Guenes/elons
AN	Guenes/elon
Fp	Guenez/elon
DA	Guennes/elon
FM	Gwenylon
FF	Gwynes/lyoun
SD	Genelyn
CG	Ganellon

L	Herdre
I	E/Aird(i)re
F	Hardres
AN	-
Fp	Hardrez/ees
DA	Hardrez/s
FM	Hardree
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Andrewe

L	Garinus (Perigos)
I	Garrinus
F	Garins (Pieregort)
AN	Garins
Fp	Guerin (Peronne)
DA	Guerin (Lorraine)
FM	Garyn (Perigot)
FF	-
SD	Generyse
CG	Garyn (Perrogort)

L	Iacereth
I	Gasiredh
F	Ysorés
AN	-
Fp	-

DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Iosue
L	Galiem
I	Bater
F	Gautier
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Gwater
FF	Gauter (Tardys)
SD	-
CG	Gualtier
L	William
I	Uilliam
F	Guillaume
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Gwylmyn
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Guyllam
L	Bernardus
I	Bernardus
F	Beras/rt (Mondidier)
AN	Berard
Fp	Berart (Montdidier)
DA	Berand (Mondidier)
FM	Berard (Moundisder)
FF	Bernard (Mountendre)
SD	Bernard (Spruwse)
CG	Gerard (Mondydyer)

L	Tirri (Arderne)
I	Terre/Tirri
F	Tierris/Terris (Ardane)
AN	Terri l'Ardoneis
Fp	Tierri l'Ardenois (Ardaine)
DA	Thierry (Ardenne)
FM	Terry (Ardane)
FF	Terry (Peyteres)
SD	Tery Lardeneyis
CG	Thierry (Ardanne)
L	Gy(l)merus Scotus
I	Gilleber
F	Guilemers l'Escot
AN	-
Fp	Guillemer l'Escot
DA	Guillemer l'Escot/Escocois
FM	Gwylmer Scot
FF	Gylmer Skote
SD	-
CG	Gwyllermet Scot
L	Galfridus (Antegania)
I	Sefre
F	Jofrois l'Angevins
AN	-
Fp	Geff(roy) l'Angevin
DA	Geffroy l'Angevin (Angiers)
FM	Geffray Langevyn)
FF	Geffrey (Paris)
SD	-
CG	Geffroy l'Antigyuy/Angevyn
L	Auberus
I	Amber
F	Aubris le Borguegnon
AN	-
Fp	Aubery (Bourgogne)

DA	Aulbery (Bourgoingne)
FM	Aubry
FF	Aubrey (Burgoyne)
SD	-
CG	Am/uber(t)

L	Gerarinus
I	-
F	-
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

L	Turpinus
I	Turpinus
F	Turpin
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Turpin (Rains)
FM	Turpin
FF	-
SD	Turpyn
CG	Turpyn

L	Garceret
I	-
F	Anguirés (Loheraine)
AN	-
Fp	Guiberz (Lombardie)
DA	Augere
FM	Angwyron
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Eugynes

L	Basinus (Genevs)
I	Ba(r)sinus (Genes)
F	Basins (Genevois)
AN	-
Fp	Basin (Lengres)
DA	Basin (Gennes)
FM	Basyn
FF	Bausyn (Senek)
SD	-
CG	Basyn Benevoys
L	G(u)ido (Burgundia)
I	G(y)ide (Burguinne)
F	Guis (Borgoigne)
AN	Gy(on) (Burgoine)
Fp	Guy(on) (Bourgoigne)
DA	Guy (Bourgoingne)
FM	Gy(on) (Borgoyne)
FF	Gy(oun) (Burgoyne)
SD	Gy (Bourgoyne)
CG	Guy (Bourgoyne)
L	Milo (Anglia)
I	-
F	Milo (E/Aingler)
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Milon (Puille)
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

At this point, the Latin text breaks off.

I	Guinies
F	Guenes/elons
AN	Guenes/elun

Fp	Guenez/elon
DA	Guennes/elon
FM	Gwenylon
FF	Gwynes/lyoun
SD	Genelyn
CG	Ganellon
I	Maccairi
F	Macaires
AN	-
Fp	Macaire
DA	Mac/quaire
FM	Malkare
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Machayre
I	Gaibfreas
F	Grifonnet (Autefuelle)
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Gueffroy (Haultefeille)
FM	Geffroun
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Geffroy
I	Alloire
F	Aloris
AN	Alloris
Fp	Allory
DA	Alory
FM	Alorys
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Alory

I	Helol
F	Oel (Nantes)
AN	-
Fp	Houel (Nantez)
DA	Houuel (Nantes)
FM	Howel
FF	Hoel
SD	-
CG	Ho(w)el (Nautes)

I	Riol
F	Ri/ao(u)l (Amiens)
AN	-
Fp	Raoul (Le Mans)
DA	Raoul (Amiens)
FM	Raoul
FF	Raoul
SD	-
CG	Ryol (Le Mans)

The Saracens

L	Admirandus Balant
I	Adhmirandus [Balangc]
F	Amirans Balan
AN	Laban (Espagne)
Fp	Amiral Bala(a)n
DA	Admiral Balaan/m
FM	Amyral Balan
FF	Balam (Nubye)
SD	Laban
CG	Admyral Ballan(t)

L	Fortibras (Alexandria)
I	Fortibras (Alaxanndrie)
F	Fierabras (Alixandre)
AN	Fierembras (Alisandre)
Fp	Fierabras (Alixandre)

DA	Fier(r)abras(Alexandrie)
FM	Fyrumbras (Alysandre)
FF	Firumbras (Alisaundre)
SD	Ferumbras
CG	Fyerabras
L	Florentinn/tius
I	Florenntinus
F	Florans/iens
AN	Florien
Fp	Flourent
DA	Florent
FM	Florens
FF	Florent
SD	Floreyn
CG	Floren
L	Floripes
I	Floripes
F	Floripas
AN	Floripas
Fp	Flo/euripes
DA	Floripais
FM	Florippe
FF	Floryp
SD	Florip(as)
CG	Florypes
L	Brulandus (Momi(f)ra/et)
I	Brulandus
F	Brulans (Monmirés)
AN	Brullant (Momirré)
Fp	Bruillant (Montmiray)
DA	Bru(il)lant (Montmirre)
FM	Bruyllant (Mountmirre)
FF	Burlyaunt (Marmorye)
SD	Brouland
CG	Bruyllant (Mommere)

L	Glaugis
I	Glacis
F	Clar/gis
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Kargys
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Clorgys
L	Mora(n)/odas
I	Mora(nn)das
F	Morida
AN	-
Fp	Moradas
DA	Moradas
FM	Moradas
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Marad/bas
L	Turgisins
I	Tuirgin
F	Torgis
AN	-
Fp	Torquinal
DA	-
FM	Turgys
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Turgys
L	Sortib(r)ant (Cornubia)
I	Sortibrannd (Cornubia)
F	Sortibrans/t (Conibres)
AN	Sortibrans (Combrer)
Fp	Sortibault (Con(i)bres)

DA	Sortib(r)ant (Conimbres)
FM	Sortybrant (Combles)
FF	Sokebrond
SD	Sortybraunce
CG	Sortybrant (Conymbres)

L	Marganus
I	Marganus
F	Margaris
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Margaris

L	Corsabilis
I	Corsubules
F	Corsuble
AN	-
Fp	Corsabel
DA	Corssubles
FM	Corsyband
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Corsuble

L	Athenas
I	Athenas
F	Acenas
AN	-
Fp	Athenas (Nubie)
DA	Athanas (Nubie)
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Athenas

L	Amangis
I	Amaingis
F	Amulgis
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Maugis (Aigremort)
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Amancdys

L	Barbec(h)as
I	Barbec
F	Barbadas
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Barbarant (Maisonne)
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Barbacas

L	Brutamunt
I	Brutaminnt
F	Brudamons
AN	Brutaman
Fp	-
DA	Brutamon
FM	Brytamon
FF	-
SD	Bretomayn
CG	Brutamont

L	Haymerus
I	Hamerus
F	Aymer
AN	-
Fp	-

DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-
L	Lausag
I	Lausa
F	-
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-
L	Matusale
I	-
F	Matusale
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Mathusale
L	Gloir
I	-
F	Floire
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Floyre
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Florymonde

L	Claremunda
I	Claraminnda
F	Claremonde
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Clarymounde
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Clarmondye

L	Loreta
I	Loreca
F	Flourete
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Floraunce
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Florette

L	Maragunda
I	Marg(ar)unnda
F	Morabunde
AN	Maragunde
Fp	-
DA	Maragonde
FM	Maragounde
FF	-
SD	Maragonde
CG	Maragonde

L	Lucafer(Blandas)
I	Lucafer
F	Lucafer (Baudas)
AN	Lucafer (Baldas)
Fp	Lucafer (Bau(l)dras)

DA	Lucaffer (Bandas)
FM	Lucafer (Bandas)
FF	Lucafer
SD	Lukafer (Baldas)
CG	Lucafar (Bandas)

L	Milon
I	-
F	Milon
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	Myloun
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

L	Galafer
I	Calef
F	Galiene
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

L	Marsilion
I	-
F	Garsiliuns
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

L	Coldref
I	Coldres/Goldres
F	Cordroé
AN	-
Fp	Cadoz
DA	-
FM	Coudryn
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Coldroe
L	Malpinus
I	Malpin(us)
F	Ma(u)brun/Maubrun
AN	Maupin
Fp	Torquin
DA	-
FM	Maubyn (Egremolee)
FF	Ma(n)byn
SD	Mapyn
CG	Marpyn
L	Clarion
I	Clarion
F	Clarions/um
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Clar(i)on
FM	Clarion (Gryes)
FF	Claryon
SD	-
CG	Claryon
L	Geimper
I	Giber
F	Tempie
AN	-
Fp	-

DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

At this point the Latin text breaks off.

I	Toirnefer
F	Tournefier
AN	Tauper
Fp	Tournefier
DA	Tournefier/Tournefer
FM	Cornyfer
FF	-
SD	Tamper
CG	Cornyfer

I	Cordres
F	Amirans de Cordres
AN	Admiraille de Cosdres
Fp	Amirant de Cordoue/dres
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	Admiral of Cosdroye
CG	-

I	Mabon
F	Mabon
AN	Mabon
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	Mavon
CG	Mahon

I	Easpu/alard
F	Espaulars (Nubie)
AN	Espiard
Fp	Espauillart (Nubie)
DA	Espaulart (Nubie)
FM	Aspayllard
FF	-
SD	Espiard
CG	Espouart

I	Galafer
F	Aga/olafres
AN	Agoulafre
Fp	Agoullaffre
DA	Galafre
FM	Agolafre
FF	Gulfagor
SD	Alagolafur
CG	Galafre

I	Anfedus
F	Effraons
AN	-
Fp	Ansetous
DA	Anfeton/Antefons
FM	Enfachoun
FF	Fycon
SD	-
CG	Ampheon

I	Anota
F	Amiote
AN	-
Fp	Amyote
DA	Ami(o)te
FM	Amyote

FF	Amyet
SD	-
CG	Amyotte

I	Tenebre
F	Tenebrés
AN	-
Fp	Tenebre
DA	-
FM	Tenebre
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Tenebres

Saracen Gods

L	Mac(h)o/ametus
I	Macamet
F	Mahom(et)
AN	Mahon
Fp	-
DA	Mahom(met)
FM	Mahoun
FF	Mahoun
SD	Mahound
CG	Mahom(met)

L	Margoth
I	Margoth
F	Margos
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	Margot
SD	-
CG	Margot

L	Ternegant
I	Tergont
F	Tervagans
AN	Tervagant
Fp	-
DA	Tervagant
FM	Ternagan
FF	Termagaunt
SD	Termagant
CG	Termagaunt

L	Iuipin
I	Impiu
F	Jupins
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	Iupin
FM	Iupiter/Iouyn
FF	Iubiter
SD	Jubyter
CG	Iupyn

L	Apolin
I	Apolin
F	Apolins
AN	Appolin
Fp	-
DA	Apolin
FM	Appolyn
FF	Appolyn
SD	Appolyn
CG	Appollyn

Swords and Smiths

In the French poem, the Latin text and CG, these names all appear in a list, which must have been present in the source text for the Latin translation. Below, for those texts which use some of the names, but not in this list, the names are asterisked³.

L	Plorans/te
I	Ploranti
F	Plourance
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	*Plorance
FM	*Ploraunce
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Plourance
L	Bapteym
I	Bapten/Paten
F	Bautisme
AN	-
Fp	*Bautisme/Baciesme
DA	*Baptisme
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Baptysme
L	Graban
I	Garban
F	Garbain
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	*Gabrience
FM	-
FF	-

³Note: these asterisked names were ignored for the purposes of illustrating the distinctive list of names in Part One, Chapter Four, Section Two.

SD -
CG Grabam

L Joyus
I -
F Joieuse
AN *Joieuse
Fp -
DA -
FM -
FF -
SD -
CG Ioyouse

L Hauteclere
I -
F Hauteclere
AN -
Fp -
DA *Haulteclere
FM *Hautecler
FF *Haunchecler
SD -
CG Haulteclere

L Fortbrige
I -
F Floberge
AN -
Fp -
DA -
FM -
FF -
SD -
CG Floberge

L Durindal
I -

F	Durendal
AN	*Dorendale
Fp	*Durendal
DA	*Durendal
FM	*Durendal
FF	*Dorinydale
SD	*Durendale
CG	Durandal

L	Sanguine
I	-
F	Musanguine
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Sauuogaye

L	Curtem
I	-
F	Courtain
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	*Courtain
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Cortan

L	Golians
I	-
F	Galans
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-

FF	-
SD	-
CG	Galaus
L	Munificas
I	-
F	Munificas
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Munyfycans

L	Agrifax
I	-
F	Aurisas
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Aynisiac

Places

L	Sanctus Dyonisius
I	Sin Dinis
F	Saint Denis
AN	Saint De/ynis
Fp	Sainct Denis
DA	-
FM	-
FF	Seynt Denys
SD	Seynte Denyse
CG	-

L	Ierosolim
I	-
F	Jherusalem
AN	-
Fp	Jherusalem
DA	Iherusalem
FM	Ierusalem
FF	-
SD	-
CG	Iherusalem

L	Roma
I	Roim.
F	Romme
AN	Rome
Fp	Rome(z)
DA	Romme
FM	Rome
FF	-
SD	Rome
CG	Rome

L	Francia
I	Fraing
F	Franc(h)
AN	Fra(u)nce
Fp	France
DA	France
FM	Fraunce
FF	Fraunce
SD	Fraunce
CG	Fraunce

L	Egrimor
I	Egrimor
F	Aigremore
AN	A(i)gremore
Fp	Aegremore

DA	Aigremoir/ne
FM	Egremoyne
FF	Egremoyne
SD	E/Agremour
CG	Agrymore

L	Mantribil
I	Ma/uinntribil
F	Mautribile
AN	Mautrib(l)e
Fp	Mautruble
DA	Mautuble
FM	Mantribile
FF	Mautreble
SD	Mautribile
CG	Mantryble

L	Colconia
I	Coltonia
F	Corcoil
AN	-
Fp	-
DA	-
FM	-
FF	-
SD	-
CG	-

L	Flagol/Flagor
I	Fladol
F	Flagot
AN	Flagot
Fp	Flagot
DA	Flagot/Flogot
FM	Flagot
FF	Flagot
SD	Flagot
CG	Flagot

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography aims to include all the items to which reference is made in the footnotes to the text, both primary and secondary. There are a number of further references to secondary and tertiary works, including modern scholastic tools such as the *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, which have proved most influential in the preparation of this thesis. Appended is a full list of the relevant editions of the primary sources which have been consulted at some stage during the course of the research.

EDITION OF *GESTA KAROLI MAGNI* - PREPARATION AND LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

This brief opening section lists all the texts that were of use from the initial examination of the manuscript through the editing of the text and the subsequent consideration of the edition with respect to the Medieval Latin language.

Latin Palaeography

The works listed here concern the identification of the characteristics of the script, and the expansion of the abbreviations employed by the scribe.

Bibliography

L.E.Boyle, *Medieval Latin Palaeography - a Bibliographical Introduction*, Toronto, 1984.

Works on Palaeography

M.P.Brown, *A Guide to Western Historical Scripts from Antiquity to 1600*, London, 1990.

A.Cappelli, *Dizionario de Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane*, Milan, 1912.

Latin Language

The dictionaries are those that were of use in the preparation of the edition. The works that concern Medieval Latin language were used to provide examples of the features of Medieval Latin that are relevant to *Gesta Karoli Magni*.

Dictionaries

F.Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'Ancienne Langue Française du IX au XV Siècle*, 10 vols., Paris, 1880-1902.

C.T.Lewis & C.Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1879 - impression of 1975.

D.P.Simpson, *Cassell's New Latin-English English-Latin Dictionary*, London, 3rd ed., 1964.

Works on Medieval Latin Language

R.A.Browne, *British Latin Selections A.D. 500-1400*, Oxford, 1954.

D.Norberg, 'Le Latin après l'An 1000' in his *Manuel Pratique de Latin Médiéval*, *Connaissances des Langues* vol.4, Paris, 1968, pp.68-92.

Rev. H.P.V.Nunn, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin*, Cambridge, 1922.

L.R.Palmer, *The Latin Language*, London, 1954.

K.Strecker, *An Introduction to Medieval Latin*, Berlin, 1957.

BACKGROUND FROM THE DICTIONARY OF THE MIDDLE AGES

J.R.Strayer, (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 12 vols., New York, 1982-9.

These recently compiled volumes contain a number of articles that provide very accessible sketches of various topics, providing easy reference to historical details. The following list contains all the articles pertaining to historical or literary topics to which reference has been made in the footnotes, plus certain additional articles of importance to the thesis. (Note: the articles concerning ^{the} subject of relevance to this project that is best summarised, that is the Old Norse 'Matter' translations, have been listed later in the section concerning Old Norse literature.)

Historical Articles

- W.C.Jordan, 'Angevins: France, England, Sicily', vol.1, New York, 1982, pp.253-4.
- E.L.Cox, 'Burgundy, Duchy of', vol.2, New York, 1983, pp.427-8.
- F.L.Cheyette in 'Cathars', vol.3, New York, 1983, pp.181-91.
- H.Nickel, 'Chivalry, Orders of.', vol.3, New York, 1983, pp.301-3.
- J.H.Hill, 'Crusades to 1192', vol.4, New York, 1984, pp.33-41.
- B.Lyon, 'England: Norman-Angevin', vol.4, New York, 1983, pp.459-72.
- C.T.Wood, 'England: 1216-1485', vol.4, New York, 1983, pp.472-86.
- J.W.Baldwin, 'France: 987-1223', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.154-66.
- W.C.Jordan, 'France: 1223-1328', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.166-76.
- J.B.Henneman, 'France: 1314-1494', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.176-90.
- L.K.Little, 'Friars', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.297-8.
- J.van der Meulen, 'Gothic Architecture', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.580-602.
- M.R.Powicke, 'Hundred Years' War', vol.6, New York, 1985, pp.331-5.
- J.F.Lydon, 'Ireland: After 1155', vol.6, New York, 1985, pp.517-20.
- W.C.Jordan, 'Louis IX of France', vol.7, New York, 1986, pp.674-6.
- J.B.Heneman, 'Louis XI of France', vol.7, New York, 1986, pp.676-7.
- G.S.Burgess, 'Marie de Champagne', vol.8, New York, 1987, p.135.
- K.Helle, 'Norway', vol.9, New York, 1987, pp.179-86.
- L.E.Sullivan, 'Paris', vol.9, New York, 1987, pp.401-7.
- N.Houseley, 'Pilgrimage, Western European', vol.9, New York, 1987, pp.654-61.
- M.Kowaleski, 'Poll Tax, English', vol.10, New York, 1988, pp.26-7.
- T.Head, 'Relics', vol.10, New York, 1988, pp.296-9.
- C.F.Barnes Jr., 'Ste. Chapelle, Paris', vol.10, New York, 1988, pp.623-4.
- J.J.Contreni, 'Schools, Cathedral', vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.59-63.
- H.Kaminsky, 'Schism, Great', vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.38-42.
- J.Y.Mariotte, 'Switzerland', vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.536-46.
- J.W.Clinton, 'Tabriz', vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.570-1.

A.L.Gabriel, 'Universities', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.282-300.

J.Lydon, 'Wales: History', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.513-25.

P.Saccio, 'Wars of the Roses', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.569-73.

Literary Topics

W.T.H.Jackson, 'Alexander Romances', vol.1, New York, 1982, pp.149-52.

R.W.Ackerman, 'Arthurian Literature', vol.1, New York, 1982, pp.564-75.

B.Merrilees, 'Anglo-Norman Literature', vol.1, New York, 1982, pp.259-72.

A. Cameron, 'Anglo-Saxon Literature', vol.1, New York, 1982, pp.274-88.

N.F.Blake, 'Caxton, William', vol.3, New York, 1983, pp.210-1.

E.A.Heinemann, 'Chansons de Geste', vol.3, New York, 1983, pp.257-63.

M.A.Freeman, 'Chrétien de Troyes', vol.3, New York, 1983, pp. 308-11.

F.E.Cranz, 'Classical Literary Studies', vol.3, New York, 1983, pp.430-6.

R.H. & M.A.Rouse, 'Codicology, Western European', vol.3, New York, 1983, pp.475-8.

K.D.Uitti, 'French Literature: to 1200', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.232-54.

K.D.Uitti, 'French Literature: after 1200', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.254-81.

D.Kelly, 'French Literature: Romances', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.283-88.

J.M.A.Beer, 'French Literature: Translations', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.288-91.

H-E.Keller, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth', vol.5, New York, 1985, pp.387-90.

S.Ó Coileáin, 'Irish Literature', vol.6, New York, 1985, pp.521-34.

A.G.Rigg, 'Latin Language', vol.7, New York, 1986, pp.350-9.

A.G.Rigg, 'Latin Literature', vol.7, New York, 1986, pp.359-71.

D.Pearsall, 'Lydgate, John', vol.7, New York, 1986, pp.690-6.

R.W.Ackerman & R.M.Lumiansky, 'Malory, Sir Thomas', vol.8, New York, 1987, pp.60-5.

P.F.Dembowski, 'Marie de France', vol.8, New York, 1987, pp.135-7.

H. Newstead, 'Matter of Britain, Matter of France, Matter of Rome', vol.8, New York, 1987, pp.223-7.

J.H.Fisher, 'Middle English Literature', vol.8, New York, 1987, pp.313-26.

- J.J.John, 'Paleography, Western European', vol.9, New York, 1987, pp.334-51.
- L.Hellinga, 'Printing, Origins of', vol.10, New York, 1988, pp.124-8.
- C.S.F.Burnett, 'Translators and Translations: Western European', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.136-42.
- G.Mermier, 'Tristan, Roman de', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.202-3.
- R.Blumenfeld-Kosinski, 'Troy Story', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.219-21.
- C.S.Ross, 'Vergil in the Middle Ages', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.393-5.
- B.F.Roberts, 'Welsh Literature: Prose', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.609-13.

THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

This section will provide a list as far as is practically possible for the secondary material that has been of most use in providing suitably detailed information about the historical background to the translation traditions of the British Isles and Scandinavia during the later Middle Ages.

General European History

The following series of historical atlases are able to give a good pictorial overview of the developments of the period.

- G.Barracough, *The Times Atlas of World History*, 3rd ed., London, 1989.
- H. Chadwick & G.R.Evans (ed.), *Atlas of the Christian Church*, London, 1987.
- D.Matthew, *Atlas of Medieval Europe*, Oxford, 1983.
- J. Riley-Smith (ed.), *The Atlas of the Crusades*, New York, 1991.

France Up to and Including the Time of Charlemagne

As a prelude to the interpretation of the 'Matter of France', these works describe the civilisation of Carolingian Europe, and show the historical Charlemagne prior to his elevation to heroic status in the chansons de geste.

S.Allott, *Alcuin of York - Life and Letters*, York, 1974.

Benedictus de Sancto Andrea, edited by K.Hahn in G.H.Pertz (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica - Scriptores*, vol.3, Hannover, 1839, p.695-722.

J.Boussard, *The Civilisation of Charlemagne*, trans. F.Partridge, London, 1968.

R.Folz, *The Coronation of Charlemagne*, trans. J.E.Anderson, London, 1974.

Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, ed.W.Arndt in *Gregori Turonensis Opera*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* 1, Hannover, 1885, pp.31-450.

Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed.O.Holder Egger, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum* 25, Hannover, 1911.

R.McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751-987*, London, 1983.

France, Britain and Norway up to the Black Death

These works provide the background to the time during which the unification of France witnessed the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle for the Relics of the Passion, and, simultaneously, the development of the translation traditions of the British Isles and Norway in response to the literary developments of contemporary France.

R-H. Bautier (ed.), *La France de Philippe Auguste: Le Temps des Mutations*, Paris, 1982.

T.K.Derry, 'Outpost of Christianity' in his *A History of Scandinavia*, London, 1979, pp.36-63.

R.Durand, *Les Campagnes Portugaises entre Douro et Tage aux XIIe et XIIIe Siècles*, Paris, 1982.

L.Grodecki, *Sainte-Chapelle*, English edition, Paris, 196?.

L.Grodecki, A.Prache & R.Recht, *Gothic Architecture*, London, 1976.

E.Hallam, *Capetian France, 987-1328*, London, 1980.

K.Helle, 'Anglo-Norwegian Relations in the Reign of Hakan Håkonsson (1217-63)' in *Medieval Scandinavia* 1, 1968, pp.101-14.

R.I.Jack, *Medieval Wales*, London, 1973.

W.C.Jordan, *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade*, Princeton, 1979.

A.L.Poolc, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216*, Oxford History of England, Oxford, 1955.

F.M.Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307*, Oxford History of England, Oxford, 1953.

P.Pulsiano & K.Wolf (ed.), *Medieval Scandinavia - an Encyclopedia*, New York, 1993.

J.Richard, *Saint Louis*, Paris, 1983.

J.R.Strayer, *The Albigensian Crusade*, New York, 1971.

D.Walker, *Medieval Wales*, Cambridge, 1990.

R.Williams, *The Lords of the Isles*, London, 1984.

Church and Politics in France and England after the Black Death

The historical developments of this period are essential for the understanding of the use of translations and adaptations of earlier texts. From the history, the texts can be interpreted with reference to the contemporary political and economic developments.

A.R.Bridbury, *Economic Growth - England in the Later Middle Ages*, London, 1962.

S.B.Chrimes, *Henry VII*, London, 1972,

É.Delaruelle et.al., *L'Église au Temps du Grand Schisme et de la Crise Conciliaire (1378-1449)*, 2 vols, Paris, 1962-4.

K.Fowler, *The Age of Plantagenet and Valois*, London, 1967.

E.F.Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485*, Oxford History of England, Oxford, 1961.

P.S.Lewis, *Later Medieval France: the Polity*, London & New York, 1968.

M.McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century, 1307-1399*, Oxford History of England, Oxford, 1959.

M.Nordberg, *Les Ducs et la Royauté: Études sur la Rivalité des Ducs d'Orléans et de Bourgogne, 1392-1407*, Uppsala, 1964.

J.N.Palmer, *England, France and Christendom, 1377-99*, London, 1972.

E.Perroy, *The Hundred Years War*, trans.W.B.Wells, London, 1951.

R.Vaughan, *Philip the Good: The Apogee of Burgundy*, Cambridge, Mass., 1970.

R.Vaughan, *Valois Burgundy*, London, 1975.

Surveys of Irish History of the Later Middle Ages

The Irish histories merit a special place. They provide the detail against which the Irish translation tradition can be set, thus enabling the texts to be interpreted in a way that is cognate with the political and ecclesiastical background.

A.Cosgrove, *Late Medieval Ireland 1370-1541*, Dublin, 1981.

A.Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, Oxford, 1987.

R.Frame, *Colonial Ireland 1169-1369*, Dublin, 1981.

A. Gwynn, 'Anglo-Irish Church Life: Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries' in P.J.Corish (ed.), *A History of Irish Catholicism* vol.2, fasc.4, Dublin, 1968.

G.Hand, 'The Church in the English Lordship 1216-1307' in P.J.Corish (ed.), *A History of Irish Catholicism* vol.2, fasc.3, Dublin, 1968.

J.F.Lydon, *Ireland in the Later Middle Ages*, Dublin, 1973.

F.McGrath S.J., *Education in Ancient and Medieval Ireland*, Dublin, 1979.

C.Mooney, *Irish Franciscan Relations with France, 1224-1850*, Killiney, 1951.

C.Mooney, 'The Church in Gaelic Ireland: Thirteenth to Fifteenth Centuries' in P.J.Corish (ed.), *A History of Irish Catholicism* vol.2, fasc.5, Dublin, 1969.

A.J. Otway-Ruthven, *A History of Medieval Ireland*, London, 1980.

K.Simms, 'The Norman Invasion and the Gaelic Recovery' in R.F.Foster (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland*, Oxford, 1989, pp.53-103.

THE LITERARY FRAMEWORK

This section will provide a similar list of works about the literary background to the translation traditions of the British Isles and Scandinavia during the later Middle Ages. Certain area will be covered in greater depth than others, representing in the first instance the relative importance of these areas, and in the second the extent to which these areas have been covered in existing bibliographies.

General Works on Literary Matters

These works supply a useful set of studies in comparative literature of relevance to the 'Matter' translation traditions of the British Isles and Scandinavia. The number of works impinging upon this subject is large, so this list represents the most useful works.

J.M.A.Beer, *A Medieval Caesar*, Geneva, 1976.

J.M.A.Beer (ed.), *Medieval Translators and their Craft*, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1989.

A.C.L.Brown, *The Origin of the Grail Legend*, Cambridge, Mass., 1943.

G.Cary, *The Medieval Alexander*, Cambridge 1956.

D.Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, trans. E.F.M.Benecke, London, 1895.

J.Crosland, 'Lucan in the Middle Ages' in *Modern Language Review* 25, 1930, pp.32-51.

M-T. d'Alverny, 'Translations and Translators' in R.L.Benson & G.Constable (ed.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Oxford, 1982, pp.421-62.

J.H.Fisher, *The Medieval Literature of Western Europe*, London, 1966.

R.Folz, *Le Souvenir et la Légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire Germanique Médiéval*, Paris, 1950.

N.E.Griffin, *Dares and Dictys - an Introduction to the Study of Medieval Versions of the Troy Story*, Baltimore, 1907.

R.S.Loomis, *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1959.

A. de Mandach, 'The Evolution of the Matter of Fierabras' in H.E.Keller (ed.), *Essays in Romance Epic*, Boston, 1987, pp. 129-39.

G.Paris, *Historie Poetique de Charlemagne*, Paris, 1865.

W.Paton, *Epic and Romance*, London, 1897.

Works on Latin Literature

This list provides only a brief set of the most important works concerning the Latin background to the tradition of 'Matter' literature; the volumes discuss the textual background and also the educational and literary framework within which the tradition was able to flourish.

Bibliographies

Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina, Société des Bollandistes, Brussels 1898-9.

H.Fros (ed.), *Bibliotheca Hagiographicarum Latinorum Novum Supplementum*, Brussels, 1986.

M.R.P.McGuire & H.Dressler, *Introduction to Medieval Latin Studies - a Syllabus and Bibliographical Guide*, 2nd ed., Washington, 1977.

Further Works on Latin Literature

E.Auerbach, *Literary Language and its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, trans. R.Manheim, London, 1965.

R.R.Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries*, Cambridge, 1954.

R.R.Bolgar, *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 500-1500*, London, 1971.

E.R.Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. W.R.Trask, London, 1953.

C.H.Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, Mass., 1927.

L.J.Paetow, *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric*, Urbana, Illinois, 1910.

Works on French Literature

The number of works concerning 'Matter' literature in France is extensive. It would be totally impractical to list every single relevant work in a bibliography here. However, it is fortunate that Medieval French literature has been surveyed in the *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age* in a manner similar to the *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*. As a result, the articles consulted have all been listed here. Also listed are the works that have been most important in the study of the *Chanson de Fierabras* and the development of the Fierabras tradition, and a small selection of volumes which have been of immense help to this project. Other bibliographical information can be obtained from the bibliographies listed.

Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age

Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - le Moyen Age, published under the direction of Cardinal Georges Grente, Paris, 1964.

Articles consulted

E.Faral, 'Introduction', pp.3-18.

R.S.Loomis, 'Arthur', pp.76-8.

- L.-F.Flutre, 'Benoit de Sainte-Maure', pp.110-1.
- R.Bossuat, 'César dans la Littérature du Moyen Age', pp.158-9.
- D.Poiron, 'Chansons de Geste', pp.164-8.
- R.N.Walpole, '*Chronique Rimée*', pp.191-2.
- R.N.Walpole, '*Chronique du Pseudo-Turpin*', pp.189-91.
- R.Bossuat, '*Chroniques de France (Les Grandes)*', pp.193-4.
- C.Cahen, 'Croisades (Littérature des)', pp.233-6.
- G.Raynaud de Lage, '*Énéas*', p.256.
- H.F.Williams, '*Fierabras*', p.276.
- M. de Riquer, 'Gaal', pp.327-32.
- G.Raynaud de Lage, '*Histoire Ancienne jusqu'à César*', pp.377-8.
- E.Vinaver, '*Lancelot-Gaal*', pp.451-2.
- H.J.Martin, 'Livre Imprimé', pp.463-70.
- J.Horrent, '*Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*', pp.578-60.
- L.-F.Flutre, '*Roman d'Alexandre*', pp.649-50.
- G.Raynaud de Lage, '*Roman de Thèbes*', pp.658-9.
- G.Oury, 'Vincent de Beauvais', pp.746-7.
- E.Francis, 'Wace', pp.759-60.

Bibliographies

- R.Bossuat, *Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age*, Melun, 1951.
- R.Bossuat, *Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age, Supplément (1949-53)*, Paris, 1955.
- R.Bossuat, *Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age, Supplément (1954-60)*, Paris, 1961.
- F.Viellard & J.Monfrin, *Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age de Robert Bossuat, Troisième Supplément (1960-80)*, vol.1, Paris, 1986 & vol.2, Paris, 1991.

Works concerning the *Chanson de Fierabras*

J.Bédier, 'La Composition de *Fierabras*' in *Romania* 17, 1888, pp.22-51.

H.Jarnik, 'Studie über die Komposition der Fierabrasdichtungen', Halle, 1903.

A.de Mandach, *Naissance et Développement de la Chanson de Geste en Europe* vol.5, Geneva, 1987.

A.de Mandach, 'A Royal Wedding-Present in the Making: Talbot's Chivalric Anthology (Royal 15 E VI) for Queen Margaret of Anjou, and the Laval-Middleton Anthology of Nottingham' in *Nottingham Mediaeval Studies* 18, 1974, pp.56-76.

A. de Mandach (ed.), 'Table Ronde sur la Geste de Fierabras, Partie 2' in *Anonyme* 1987, pp.1209-1413.

R.Mehnert, 'Neue Beiträge zum Handschriftenverhältnis der *Chanson de Fierabras*', diss. Göttingen, 1938.

M.Roques, 'L'Élément Historique dans *Fierabras*' in *Romania* 30, 1901, pp.161-76.

H.M.Smyser, 'A New Manuscript of the *Destruction of Rome* and *Fierabras*' in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* 14, 1932, pp.339-49.

Other Works on French Literature

J. Bédier, *Les Légendes Épiques, Recherches sur la Formation des Chansons de Gestes*, 4 vol., Paris, 1908-13.

M.Bendena, *The Translations of Lucan and their Influence on French Medieval Literature*, Ph.D 1976, Wayne State University, pub. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor & London, 1976.

P.Champion 'Vue Générale du XVI^e Siècle' in *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises - XVI^e Siècle*, Paris, 1964, pp.3-23.

J.Coulet, *Études sur l'Ancien Poème Français du Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient*, Montpellier, 1907.

G.Doutrepon, *La Littérature à la Cour des Ducs de Bourgogne*, Paris, 1909.

G.Doutrepon, *Les Mises en Prose des Épopées et des Romans Chevaleresques du XIV au XVI Siècle*, Geneva, 1969.

L.J.Emanuel, *The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle: Its Influence and Literary Significance with Special Reference to Medieval French Literature*, Ph.D. 1978, Penn. State University, pub. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor & London, 1980.

L.Lcivillain, 'Essai sur les Origines du Lendit', *Revue Historique* 155, 1927, pp.241-76.

R.S.Loomis, *Arthurian Literature and Chrétien de Troyes*, New York, 1949.

P.Meyer, 'Les Premières Compilations Françaises d'Histoire Ancienne', *Romania* 14, 1885, pp.1-81.

Works on English Literature

As with French, the number of items that are relevant to the 'Matter' tradition in English, including the tradition of 'Matter' translations, is extensive. Consequently, it is only the relevant articles from *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* that have been listed, along with the appropriate references to their own, detailed bibliographies, from which further references may be taken. As with French, however, the most important works that discuss the Fierabras tradition in England have been listed.

A Manual of the Writings in Middle English

J.Burke Severs (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* Fasc.1-vol.2, New Haven, 1967-1970.

A.E.Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* vols.3-8, New Haven, 1972-89.

Articles consulted

C.W.Dunn, 'Romances Derived from English Legends', fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, pp.17-37; Bibliography, pp.206-24.

H.Newstead, 'Arthurian Legends', fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, pp.39-79; Bibliography, pp.24-56.

H.M.Smyser, 'Charlemagne Legends', fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, pp.80-100; Bibliography, pp.256-66.

R.M.Lumiansky, 'Godfrey of Bouillon', fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, pp.101-3; Bibliography, pp.267-8.

R.M.Lumiansky, 'Legends of Alexander the Great', fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, pp.104-13; Bibliography, pp.268-73.

R.M.Lumiansky, 'Legends of Troy', fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, pp.114-8; Bibliography, pp.274-7.

R.M.Lumiansky, 'Legends of Thebes', fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, p.119; Bibliography, p.277.

M.J.Donovan, 'Breton Lays', fasc.1, New Haven, 1967, pp.133-43; Bibliography, pp.292-7.

R.H.Wilson, 'Malory & Caxton', vol.3, New Haven, 1972, pp.757-807; Bibliography, pp.911-51.

F.H.Ridley, 'Middle Scots Writers', vol.4, New Haven, 1973, pp.961-1060; Bibliography, pp.1123-284.

A.Renoir & C.D.Benson, 'John Lydgate', vol.6, New Haven, 1980, pp.1809-920; Bibliography, pp.2071-175.

E.D.Kennedy, 'Chronicles and Other Historical Writing', vol.8, New Haven, 1989; Bibliography, pp. 2721-947.

Works on English Fierabras Texts

R.H.Griffith, 'Malory's *Morte Darthur* and *Fierabras*' in *Anglia* 32, 1909, pp.389-98.

M.Konick, 'The Authorship of *Sir Ferumbras*', diss. U.Pennsylvania, 1953. (Dissertation Abstracts, Ann Arbor, vol.13, p.233, no. 4940.)

D.Metlitzki, *The Matter of Araby in Medieval England*, New York, 1977.

K.Reichel, *Die Mittelenglische Romanze Sir Fyrumbras und ihr Verhältnis zum Altfranzösischen und Provenzalischen Fierabras*, Breslau, 1892.

H.M.Smyser, 'The *Sowdon of Babylon* and Its Author' in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* 13, 1931, pp.185-218.

Works on Welsh Literature

The bibliographical information concerning Medieval Welsh literature is provided by the first two items in this list. The following works are all relevant in some way to the translation of 'Matter' texts into Welsh. As the number of works that deal with this subject is not large, it seems appropriate to provide a fairly comprehensive list of references that are not listed together in any existing bibliography.

D.S.Evans, *A Grammar of Middle Welsh*, Dublin, 1964.

M.Stephens, *The Oxford Companion to the Literature of Wales*, English edition, Oxford, 1986.

G.W.Goetinck, *Peredur, a Study of Welsh Tradition in the Grail Legends*, Cardiff, 1975.

A.O.H.Jarman & G.Hughes, *A Guide to Welsh Literature*, 2 vols., Swansea, 1976 & 1979.

R.S.Loomis, *Wales and the Arthurian Tradition*, Cardif, 1956.

T.Parry, *A History of Welsh Literature*, Oxford, 1955.

A.C.Rejhon, *Cân Rolant: the Medieval Welsh Version of the Song of Roland*, U. of California Publications in Modern Philology vol.113, Berkeley, 1983.

M.Watkin, 'The French Literary Influence in Mediaeval Wales' in *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorian*, 1919-20, pp.1-81.

M.Watkin, *La Civilisation Française dans les Mabinogion*, Paris, 1963.

Works on Old Norse Literature

The most comprehensive series of articles on this subject is found in J.R.Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 12 vols., New York, 1982-9. The first article listed contains a general summary of the genre. The discussions of each individual text follow. Also listed are a number of works relevant to the literary relations between the French-speaking world and Scandinavia. This list is also fairly full, as no bibliography has been prepared for this relatively small number of texts.

Old Norse 'Matter' Translations in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*

M.E.Kalinke, 'Riddarasögur', vol.10, New York, 1988, pp.389-97.

L.Lönnroth, 'Alexanders Saga', vol.1, New York, 1982, p.152.

J.E.Knirk, 'Breta Sögur', vol.2, New York, 1983, pp.365-6.

F.W.Blaisdell, 'Erex Saga', vol.4, New York, 1984, pp.504-5.

F.W.Blaisdell, 'Ívens Saga', vol.7, New York, 1986, pp.20-1.

C.B.Hieatt, 'Karlsmagnús Saga', vol.7, New York, 1986, pp.216-9.

M.E.Kalinke, 'Parcevals Saga', vol.9, New York, 1987, pp.399-400.

R.Cook, 'Strengleikar', vol.11, New York, 1988, pp.491-2.

P.Schach, 'Tristrams Saga ok Ísöndar', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.203-4.

L.Lönnroth, 'Trójumanna Saga', vol.12, New York, 1989, pp.207.

Other Works on Old Norse Literature

Les Relations Littéraires Franco-Scandinave au Moyen Age, Actes du Colloque de Liège, Paris, 1975.

P.Aebischer, *Études sur "Otinel"*, Berne, 1960.

P.Aebischer, *Textes Norrois et Littérature Française du Moyen Âge* vol.1, Geneva, 1954.

P.Aebischer, *Les Versions Norroises du "Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient" - Leurs Sources*, Paris, 1956.

G. Barnes, 'The "Riddarasögur" and Mediaeval European Literature' in *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 8, 1975, pp. 140-58.

F.W.Blaisdell, 'The So-called "Tristram-group" of the "Riddarasögur" in *Scandinavian Studies* 46, 1974, pp.134-9.

S.Einarsson, *A History of Icelandic Literature*, New York, 1957, esp.pp.162-9.

P.G.Footc, *The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle in Iceland*, London, 1959.

E.F.Halvorsen, 'L'Histoire Poétique de Charlemagne dans les Pays du Nord' in *Charlemagne et 'Épopée Romane*, Société Rencesvals, (7th International Congress, Liège, 1976), Paris, 1978, pp.59-76.

C.B.Hiett, 'Karlsmagnus Saga and the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle' in *Scandinavian Studies* 46, 1974, pp.140-50.

M.Kalinke, 'Norse Romance (Riddarasögur)' in C.J.Clover & J.Lindow (ed.), *Old Norse-Icelandic Literature - a Critical Guide*, *Ithaca*, 1985, pp.316-64.

H.G.Leach, *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1921.

L.Lönnroth, *European Sources of Icelandic Saga-Writing*, Stockholm, 1965.

K.Togeb, 'L'Influence de la Littérature Française sur les Littératures Scandinaves au Moyen Âge' in H.U.Gumbrecht (ed.), *Grundriss der Romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters* vol.1, Heidelberg, 1972, pp.333-95.

Works on Irish and Hiberno-Latin Literature

This list aims to provide as complete a list as possible of volumes and articles of use in the study of the Irish translation tradition of 'Matter' texts and the literary background of later Medieval Ireland in all relevant languages including Latin. Along with a series of secondary works are a list of the most important manuscript catalogues in which the manuscripts containing the 'Matter' texts are described, and also a list of the bibliographies from which references that have been of primary importance to this thesis are listed.

Manuscript Catalogues

Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy, 28.fascs., Dublin, 1926-70.

T.K.Abbot, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin*, Dublin, 1900.

M. Colker, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin*, vol.2, Scolar Press, Aldershot, 1991.

R.Flower, *A Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum* vol.2, London, 1926.

P. Grosjean, *Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Latinorum Bibliothecarum Dubliniensium*, in *Analecta Bollondiana*, 46, 1928, p.106-7.

M. Mac Con Mara, MSC, 'Hiberno-Latin Writings 1200-1500' in *Hiberno-Latin Newsletter* 3, 1989, p.9-11.

Bibliographies

P.W.A.Asplin, *Medieval Ireland c.1170-1495 - A Bibliography of Secondary Works*, Dublin, 1971.

P.W.A.Asplin, 'Bibliography', in A.Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* 2, Oxford, 1987, pp.827-964.

R.I.Best, *Bibliography of Irish Philology and of Printed Irish Literature*, Dublin, 1913.

R.I.Best, *Bibliography of Irish Philology and Manuscript Literature, Publications 1913-1941*, Dublin, 1942.

R.Baumgarten, *Bibliography of Irish Linguistics and Literature, 1942-1971*, Dublin, 1986.

M.Esposito, 'A Bibliography of the Latin Writers of Mediaeval Ireland' in *Studies* 2, 1913, pp.495-521.

M.Lapidge & R.Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature 400-1200*, Dublin, 1985.

M. Mac Con Mara, MSC, 'Hiberno-Latin Writings 1200-1500' in *Hiberno-Latin Newsletter* 3, 1989, p.9-11.

Further Works on Irish and Hiberno-Latin Literature

A.Bliss and J.Long, 'Literature in Norman French and English to 1534' in A.Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, Oxford, 1987, pp.708-36.

A.Bruford, 'Gaelic Folktales and Medieval Romances' in *Béalóideas* 34, 1966.

J.Carney, 'Literature in Irish' in A.Cosgrove, (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, Oxford, 1987, pp.688-707.

M.Dillon, 'Laud Misc.610' in *Celtica* 5, 1960, pp.64-76; & *Celtica* 6, 1963, pp.135-55.

G.Dottin, 'La Légende de la Prise de Troie en Irlande' in *Revue Celtique* 41, 1924, pp.149-80.

M.Esposito, 'Notes on Mediaeval Hiberno-Latin and Hiberno-French Literature' in *Hermathena* 36, 1910, pp.58-72.

M.Esposito, 'Some Further Notes on Mediaeval Hiberno-Latin and Hiberno-French Literature' in *Hermathena* 37, 1911, pp.325-33.

M. Esposito, 'Une Version Latine du Roman de *Fierabras*' in *Romania* 62, 1936, pp.534-541.

R. Flower, *The Irish Tradition*, Oxford, 1947, esp.1927 lecture 'Ireland in Medieval Europe', pp.107-41.

W.Gillies, 'Arthur in Gaelic Tradition. Part 2: Romances and Learned Lore' in *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 3, 1982, pp.41-75.

P.Grosjean, S.J., 'MS.A.9 (Franciscan Convent, Dublin)' in *Ériu* 10, 1928, pp.160-9.

E.J.Gwynn, 'The Manuscript Known as the Liber Flavus Fergusiorum' in *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 26, Sec. C, 1906, pp.15-41.

F.Henry and G.Marsh-Micheli, 'Manuscripts and Illuminations, 1169-1603' in A.Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland* vol.2, Oxford, 1987, pp.781-815.

E.Hoade (ed.), *Western Pilgrims : The Itineraries of Fr. Simon Fitzsimons (1322-23) and Others*, Jerusalem, 1952.

D.Hyde, *A Literary History of Ireland*, London, 1899.

S.Mac Airt, 'The Development of Early Modern Irish Prose' in B.Ó Cuív (ed.), *Seven Centuries of Irish Learning*, Radio Éireann, Dublin, 1961, pp.124-6.

P.Mac Cana, 'La Traduction des Épopées Étrangères en Irlandais' in G.Contamine (ed.), *Traduction et Traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, Paris, 1989, pp.77-84.

Fr. M. Mac Con Mara, *An Léann Eaglasta in Éirinn, 1200-1500*, Dublin, 1988.

G. Mac Eoin in 'Das Verbalsystem von *Togail Troí*' in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 28, 1960-1, pp.73-136; 149-223.

R.T.Meyer in 'The Middle-Irish Version of the *Aeneid*', *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 11, 1966, pp.97-108.

R.T.Meyer in 'The Sources of the Middle Irish *Alexander*', in *Modern Philology* 47, 1949, pp.1-7.

R.T.Meyer, 'The Middle-Irish Version of the *Thebaid* of Statius', *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters* 47, 1961, pp.687-99.

R.T.Meyer, 'The Middle-Irish Version of the *Pharsalia* of Lucan' in *Proceedings of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters* 44, 1958, pp.355-63.

G.Murphy, 'Warriors and Poets in Thirteenth Century Ireland' in *Glimpses of Gaelic Ireland*, Dublin, 1948, pp.33-64.

G.Murphy, *The Ossianic Lore and Romantic Tales of Medieval Ireland*, Dublin, 1955.

N.Ní Shéaghdha, 'Translations and Adaptations into Irish', in *Celtica* 16, 1984, pp.107-24.

B. Ó Cuív (ed.), *Seven Centuries of Irish Learning*, Radio Éireann, Dublin, 1961.

B. Ó Cuív, 'Literary Creation and Irish Historical Tradition' in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 49, 1965, pp.233-62.

T.F. O'Rahilly, review of *Gabhháltas S' erluis Mhóir* by D.Hyde in *Studies* 8, 1919, p.669-71.

E.Poppe, 'The Early Modern Irish Version of *Beves of Hamtoun*' in *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 23, 1992, pp.77-98.

E.C.Quiggin, *Prologema to the Study of the Later Irish Bards 1200-1500*, London, 1913.

R.J.Rowland, 'Aeneas as a Hero in Twelfth Century Ireland', in *Vergilius* 16, 1970, pp.29-32.

M.C.Seymour, 'The Irish Version of "*Mandeville's Travels*"' in *Notes and Queries* 208, 1963, pp.364-6.

W.Stokes, *Lives of the Saints from the Book of Lismore*, Oxford, 1890.

W.B.Stanford, 'Towards a history of classical influences in Ireland', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 70 C, 1970, pp.13-91.

W.B.Stanford, *Ireland and the Classical Tradition*, Dublin, 1976.

H.L.C.Tristram, 'More Talk of Alexander' in *Celtica* 21, 1990, pp.658-63.

EDITIONS OF TEXTS

This final section will list editions of all the texts that can be described as 'Matter' translations in Irish, English, Welsh and Old Norse literature, and provide a list of editions all the Latin and French source texts. In each language in which the Fierabras story is represented, the appropriate texts are placed in a separate list. A further set of texts listed are the Irish and Hiberno-Latin texts that served as useful comparanda in the study of the 'Matter of France' in Ireland. A final group of texts are those mentioned in this project that are important for the understanding of the development of the 'Matter' tradition and the translations.

Latin Source Texts for the Three 'Matters'

'Matter of Rome'

Classical Epic Sources

Lucan, *Bellicae Libri Decem*, ed. C.Hosius, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig, 1892.

Statius, *Thebais*, ed. A.Klotz, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig, 1908.

Virgil, *Aeneis*, ed.O.Ribbeck, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig, 1893.

Late Classical Histories

Orosius, *Historiarum adversum Paganos Libri Septem*, ed.C. Zangemeister, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiae Latinorum vol.5, Vienna, 1882.

Pseudo-Dares Phrygius, De Excidio Troie Historia, ed. F. Meister, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig, 1873.

Julius Valerius, *Res Gestae Alexandri Macedonis*, ed. B.Kübler, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig, 1888.

Julii Valerii Epitome, ed.J.Zacher, Halle, 1867.

Medieval Epics and Histories

Guido delle Colonne, *Historia Destructionis Troiae*, ed. N.E.Griffin, Cambridge, Mass., 1936.

Archpriest Leo, *Historia de Preliis*, ed.F.Pfister, Sammlung. Mittellat. Texte, vol.4, Heidelberg, 1913.

Walter of Châtillon, *Alexandreis*, ed.M.Colker, Padua, 1978.

'Matter of France'

Historical Compilation

Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, ed.Erlangen, 1893.

Texts concerning Charlemagne

Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus Clavum et Coronam Domini a Constantinopoli Aquisgrani Detulerit, ed.G.Rauschen in *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Geschichtskunde vol.7, Leipzig, 1890, pp.103-25.

Iter Hierosolymitanum, ed. F.Castets, *Revue des Langues Romanes* 36, 1892, pp.417-74.

Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle, ed.C.Meredith Jones, Paris, 1936.

'Matter of Britain'

Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britanniae*, ed.A.Briscom, New York, 1929.

Old French Sources and Comparanda

'Matter of Rome'

Twelfth-Century Romans d'Antiquité

Roman d'Alixandre, ed. E.C.Armstrong et al., 6 vols., Princeton, 1937-55.

Roman d'Énéas, ed. J.J.Salverda de Grave, Paris, 1925.

Roman de Thèbes, ed. L.Constans, Société des Anciennes Textes Françaises, Paris, 1890.

Roman de Troie, ed. L.Constans, Société des Anciennes Textes Françaises, Paris, 1904-12.

Caesar - Histories and Romance

Faits des Romains, ed. L.-F.Flutre and K.Sneyders de Vogel, Paris and Groningen, 1938.

Jehan de Tuim, *Histoire de Julius César*, ed. F.Settegast, Halle, 1881.

Jacos de Forêt, *Roman de Jules César*, ed. Bendena, *The Translations of Lucan and their Influence on French Medieval Literature*, Ann Arbor, 1976, pp.130-488.

'Matter of France'

General Histories in Prose and Verse

Philippe Mousket, *Chroniques Rimées*, ed.F.Reiffenberg, Brussels, 1836.

Les Grandes Chroniques de France, ed. J.Viard, Société de l'Histoire de France, 10 vol., Paris, 1920-38.

L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conquête de la Terre Outremer, ed.P.Paris in *Guillaume de Tyr et ses Continuators*, 2.vols, Paris, 1879-80.

The Chanson de Fierabras and Related Texts

Chanson de Fierabras, ed.M.A.Kræber & G.Servois in *Chanson de Fierabras. Parise la Duchesse*, Les Anciens Poètes de la France vol.4, Paris, 1860, p.1-204.

(Errata listed by M.Le Person, 'Liste des Vers Sautés, Ajoutés ou Déformés dans l'Édition par A.Kræber et G.Servois du *Fierabras* (Paris, 1860) in A.de Mandach (ed.), 'Table Ronde sur la Geste de Fierabras, Partie 1', *Anonyme 1987*, pp.1215-28.)

Chanson de Fierabras. MS. IV. 578 de Hanovre, ed. A.Hilka & A. de Mandach, Neuchâtel, 1981.

La Destruction de Rome, Première Branche de la Chanson de Geste *Fierabras*, ed. G.Groeber in *Romania* 2, 1873, pp.1-48.

La Destruction de Rome, ed.L.Formisano, Florence, 1981.

La Destruction de Rome et Fierabras ed. L. Brandin, in *Romania* 64, 1938, pp.18-100.
Fierabras en Occitan, ed. G. Reimer, Berlin, 1830.

Charlemagne - Histories and Chansons de geste

Chanson d'Aspremont, ed. L. Brandin, 2 vols., Paris, 1924.

Chanson d'Otinél, ed. F. Guessard & H. Michelant in '*Gui de Bourgogne, Otinél*',
 Anciens Poètes de la France, vol.1, Paris, 1859.

Chanson des Quatre Fils Aymon, ed. F. Castets, Montpellier, 1909.

Chanson des Saisnes, ed. A. Brasseur, Geneva, 1989.

La Chevalerie Ogier de Danemarche, ed. J. Barrois, 2 vols., Paris, 1842.

Girart de Vienne, ed. R. Louis in *Girart de Vienne, Girart de Fraite, Girart de Roussillon*, 2 vols., Auxerre, 1947.

Huon de Bordeaux, ed. F. Guessard & C. Grandmaison, Paris, 1860.

Pèlerinage de Charlemagne, ed. G. S. Burgess in G. S. Burgess & A. E. Corby, *The Pilgrimage of Charlemagne and Aucassin and Nicolette*, New York & London, 1988, pp.1-92.

Redacted Johannis Turpin, ed. R. N. Walpole, U. California, 1976.

The Song of Roland, ed. G. J. Brault, London, 1978.

Les Textes de la Chanson de Roland, ed. R. Mortier, 10 vol., Paris, 1939-44.

'Matter of Britain'

Historical Texts in Verse

Wace, *Roman de Brut*, ed. I. Arnold, 2 vols., Société des Anciennes Textes Françaises, Paris, 1938-40.

Benoît de Sainte-Maure, *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie*, ed. F. Michel, Paris, 1836-44.

Verse Romances and Lais by Twelfth-Century Authors

Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligés*, ed. W. Foerster, Amsterdam, 1965.

Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec et Enide*, ed. C. W. Carroll, New York and London, 1987.

Chrétien de Troyes, *Lancelot*, ed. W. W. Kibler, New York and London, 1984.

Chrétien de Troyes, *Perceval*, ed. K. Busby, Tübingen, 1993.

Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain*, ed. W. W. Kibler, New York and London, 1985.

Marie de France, *Lais*, ed.J.Lods, Classiques Français du Moyen Age vol.87, Paris, 1959.

Thomas, *Tristan*, ed.B.Wind, Geneva, 1960.

Thirteenth-Century Developments of the Chrétien Tradition

La Continuation de Perceval, ed.M.R. Williams, Paris, 1922-5.

The Continuations of the Old French Perceval, ed.W.Roach, Philadelphia, 1949-83.

Perlesvaus, ed.W.A.Nitze, 2 vols., Chicago, 1932-7.

Le Roman de l'Etoire dou Graal, ed.W.A.Nitze, Paris, 1927.

The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances, ed.H.O.Sommer, 7 vols., Washington, 1909-13.

Verse English-Hero Romances of the Twelfth Century

Boeue de Hamtun, ed. A.Stimming, Bibliotheca Normantica vol.7, Halle, 1899.

Gui de Warewic, ed.A.Ewert, Paris, 1933.

Horn, ed.M.K.Pope, Anglo-Norman Texts vols 9-10 & 12-3, Oxford, 1955-64.

Middle French Sources and Comparanda

'Matter of Rome'

Prose Alexander Romances

Fuerre de Gadres, ed.E.C.Armstrong & A.Foulet, *The Medieval French "Roman d'Alexandre"* vol.4, Princeton, 1942.

Voeux du Paon, ed.R.L.G.Ritchie in *The Buick of Alexander*, Scottish Text Society, vols.12,21,25, Edinburgh, 1921-9.

Printed Prose Adaptations

Raoul Lefèvre, *Jason et Medée*, pub.N.Philippi & M.Reinhard, Lyons, 1480.

Raoul Lefèvre, *Le Recueil des Histoires de Troyes*, pub. C.Mansion, Bruges, 1477.

'Matter of France'

Chanson de Fierabras - Prose Adaptations

D.Aubert, *Chroniques et Conquêtes de Charlemagne*, ed.R.Guiette, Brussels, 1940.

Jean Bagnyon, *Fierabras*, pub.J.Maillet, Lyons, 1489.

Roman de Fierabras, ed.J.Miquet, Montréal, 1984.

'Matter of Britain'Later Arthurian Romances

Le Bel Inconnu, ed. C.Hippeau, Paris, 1860.

Ponthus et la Belle Sidonie, ed. C.Dalbann & E.Droz in *Livres à Gravures Imprimés à Lyon au Quinzième Siècle* vol.3, Lyons, 1926.

English 'Matter' Translations**'Matter of Rome'**Alexander Romances

King Alexander, ed.G.V.King, Early English Text Society vols.227,237, London, 1952,57.

'The Alliterative Alexander Fragments', ed.W.W.Skeat: first fragment in *The Gestes of the Worthie King and Emperour Alisaunder of Macedonie*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series,vol.1, London, 1867; second in *Alexander and Dindimus*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.31, London, 1878; third in *The Wars of Alexander*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.47, London, 1886.

Buik of Alexander, ed.R.L.G.Ritchie, Scottish Text Society vols.12,17,21,25, Edinburgh, 1921-9.

'The Cambridge Alexander-Cassamus Fragment', ed.K.Roskopf, *Editio princeps des Cassamus (Aleanders-Fragmentes)*, Munich, 1911.

Prose Alexander, ed.J.S.Westlake, Early English Text Society vol.143, London, 1913.

Romances concerning Troy (and Thebes)

Geste Historiale of the Destruction of Troy, ed. G.A.Panton & D.Donaldson, Early English Text Society vols. 39,56, London, 1866,74.

Laud Troy-Book, ed.J.E.Wülfing, Early English Text Society vols.121-2, London, 1902-4.

The Seege or Batayle of Troye, ed.M.E.Barnicle, Early English Text Society vol.172, London, 1927.

The *Sege of Thebes & the Sege of Troy*, ed.F.Brie in 'Zwei Mittelenglische Prosaromane: The *Sege of Thebes* and the *Sege of Troy*', *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* vol.130.40.

Two Scottish Troy Fragments, ed.C.Horstmann, 2 vols., Heilbronn, 1881.

Troy (and Thebes) Texts by Lydgate and Caxton

W.Caxton, *The History of Jason*, ed.J.Munro, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.111, London, 1913.

W.Caxton, *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, ed.H.H.Sparling, 2 vols., London, 1892.

J.Lydgate, *Siege of Thebes*, ed.A.Erdmann & E.Ekwall, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.108, London, 1911.

J.Lydgate, *Troy Book*, ed.H.Bergen, Early English Text Society, Extra Series vols.97,103,106,126, London, 1906-35.

'Matter of France'

Verse Romances of the 'Firumbras' Group

Fillingham Firumbras, ed.M.I.O'Sullivan in *Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, Early English Text Society, vol.198, Oxford, 1935, pp.xv-xlii;1-58.

Sir Ferumbras, ed.S.J.Herrtage, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.34, London, 1879.

Sowdon of Babylon, ed.E.Hausknecht, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.38, London, 1881.

The 'Otuel' Group and Other Texts concerning Charlemagne

The Boke of Duke Huon de Burdeux, ed.S.Lee, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols 40,41, 43, 50, London, 1882-7.

Otuel and Roland, ed.M.I.O'Sullivan in *Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, Early English Text Society vol.198, London, 1935.

Roland and Vernagu & Otuel a Knight, ed.S.J.Herrtage in *The Taill of Rauf Coilyear, Roland and Vernagu, and Otuel*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.39, London, 1882.

The Sege of Melayne & Duke Roland and Sir Otuel of Spain, ed. S.J.Herrtage, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.35, London, 1880.

The Song of Roland, ed.S.J.Herrtage, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.35, London, 1880.

'Matter of France' Texts (including a Fierabras Text) by Caxton

W.Caxton, *Charles the Great*, ed.S.J.Herrtage, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.36-7, London, 1880/1.

W.Caxton, *The Foure Sonnes of Aymon*, ed.O.Richardson, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.44-5, London, 1884-5.

W.Caxton, *Godefroy of Boloyne*, ed.M.N.Colvin, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.64, London, 1893.

Scottish History Referring to the Fierabras Story

J.Barbour, *Bruce*, ed.W.W.Skeat, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.55, London,1889, bk. 3, 1.435-66.

'Matter of Britain'

Verse History

La3amon, *Brut*, ed.G.L.Brook & R.F.Leslie, Early English Text Society, vols.250, 277, London, 1963 & 1978.

Arthurian Romances in Prose and Verse

Arthour and Merlin, ed.E.Kölbing, Leipzig, 1890.

Joseph of Arimathie, ed.W.W.Skeat, Early English Text Society vol.44, London, 1871.

Lai le Freine, ed.H.Varnhagen, *Anglia* 3, 1880, pp.415-25.

Lancelot of the Laik, ed.W.W.Skeat, Early English Text Society vol.6, London, 1865 (2nd.edition, 1905).

Libeaus Desconus, ed.Ritson, Edinburgh, 1891.

Le Morte Arthur, ed.J.D.Bruce, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vol.88, London, 1903.

Prose Merlin, ed.H.b.Wheatley, Early English Text Society vols.10,21,36,112, London, 1875-1938.

Sir Launfal, ed.L.Erling, Kempten, 1883.

Sir Tristrem, ed. G.P.McNeill, Scottish Text Society vol.8, Edinburgh 1886.

Ywain and Gawain, ed. G.Schleich, Leipzig, 1887.

Arthurian Romances by Lovelich and Malory

H.Lovelich, *History of the Holy Grail*, ed.F.J.Furnivall, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 20,24,28,30, London, 1874-8.

H.Lovelich, *Merlin*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.93,112, London, 1904 & 1932.

T.Malory, *Le Morte Darthur*, ed.J.Cowen, 2 vols., Baltimore, 1969.

English-Hero Romances

Bevis of Hampton, ed.E.Kölbing, Early English Text Society, Extras Series, vols. 46,48,65, London, 1885-94.

Guy of Warwick, ed.J.Zupitza, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, vols.42,49,59, London, 1883-91.

King Horn, ed.J.R.Lumby, Early English Text Society vol.14, London, 1866 (re-ed. G.H.McKnight, London, 1901).

King Ponthus, ed.F.J.Mather jr. in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 12, 1897.

Welsh 'Matter Translations

'Matter of Rome'

Ystoria Dared, ed. J.Rhys & J.G.Evans, *The Text of the Bruts from the Red Book of Hergest*, Oxford, 1890, pp.1-39.

'Matter of France'

Ystorya Carolo Magno, ed.S.J.Williams, Cardiff, 1930, trans. Rev.R.Williams in *Y Cymmrodor* 20, 1907.

'Matter of Britain'

Histories

Brut y Brenhinedd, ed. J.Rhys & J.G.Evans, *The Text of the Bruts from the Red Book of Hergest*, Oxford, 1890, pp.40-256.

Brut y Tywysogion, ed.T.Jones, Cardiff, 1955.

Arthurian Romances

Geraint, ed.J.Rhys & J.G.Evans, *The Text of the Mabinogion and Other Welsh Tales from the Red Book of Hergest*, Oxford, 1887, pp.244-95.

Owein, ed. R.L.Thomson, Dublin, 1968.

Peredur, ed. G.W.Goetinck, Cardiff, 1976.

Y Seint Graal, ed.R.Williams, London, 1876.

English-Hero Romance

Ystorya Bown de Hamtwn, ed.M.Watkin, Cardiff, 1958.

Old Norse 'Matter' Translations

'Matter of Rome'

Alexanders Saga, ed.C.R.Unger, Oslo, 1848.

Trójumanna Saga, ed. J.Louis-Jensen, Copenhagen, 1963.

'Matter of France'

Karlamagnus Saga, ed.B.Vilhjálmsón, 3 vols., Reykjavík, 1961., trans. C.B.Hiett, 3 vols.,Toronto, 1975-80.

'Matter of Britain'

History

Breta Sögur (+*Trójumanna Saga*), ed. H.Erlendsson & J.Sigurðsson in *Annaler for Nordisk Oldkyndigheit*, Copenhagen, 1848.

Translations from Twelfth-Century French authors

Ívens Saga, ed.E.Kölbing, Halle, 1898.

Erex Saga, ed.F.W.Blaissdell, Copenhagen, 1965.

Parcevals Saga & Valvers þattr, ed.B.Vilhjálmsón in *Riddarasögur* vol.4, Reykjavík, 1954.

Strengleikar, ed. R.Cook & M. Tveitane, Oslo, 1986.

Tristrams Saga, ed.B.Vilhjálmsón in *Riddarasögur* vol.6, Reykjavík, 1954.

English-Hero Romance

Bevens Saga, ed.B.Vilhjálmsón, *Riddarasögur* vol.1, Reykjavík, 1954, pp.283-398.

Irish 'Matter' Translations

'Matter of Rome'

Translations (and Adaptations) from Latin Sources

In Cath Catharda, ed.W.Stokes, *Irische Texte Vierte Serie* 2, Leipzig, 1909.

Imtheachta Aeniasa, ed. G.Calder, London, 1907.

'Die irische Alexander sage', ed. E.Peters in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 30, 1967, pp.71-264.

Merugud Uilix maic Leirtis, ed.R.T.Meyer, Dublin, 1958.

Sdair Alaxandair, ed.K.Meyer in *Irische Texte Zweite Serie* 2, Leipzig, 1887, pp.16-108.

Togail na Tebe, ed. G.Calder, Cambridge, 1922.

Togail Troí, ed.W.Stokes from Book of Leinster, Calcutta, 1881; ed. W.Stokes from MS. H.2.17 in *Irische Texte Zweite Serie* 1, Leipzig, 1884, pp.3-62.

Troy Text from a Printed English Source

Sdair Ercuil ocus a Bhás, ed.G.Quin, Irish Texts' Society vol.38, Dublin, 1939.

'Matter of France'

The Fierabras Story

Sdair Fortibrais, ed.W.Stokes, *Revue Celtique* 19, 1898, pp.14-57, 118-67, 252-91, 364-93.

Note also the prefatory legend of the Cross, ed.V.E.Hull in 'Two Middle-Irish Anecdotes', *Speculum* 3, 1928, pp.98-103.

Additional Charlemagne Text

Gabháltas Sherluis Mhóir, ed.D.Hyde, Irish Texts' Society vol.19, London,1917.

'Matter of Britain'

Arthurian Text

Lorgaireacht an tSoidhigh Naomhtha, ed.S.Falconer, Dublin, 1953.

English-Hero Romances

'The Irish Lives of *Guy of Warwick* and *Bevis of Hampton*', ed, F.N.Robinson in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 6, 1908, pp.9-180, 273-338, 556.

Comparanda Texts in Irish

Irish Annals

Annals of Boyle, ed.A.M.Freeman in *Revue Celtique* 41-4, 1924-7.

Annals of Clonmacnoise, ed.Rev.D.Murphy, S.J., Dublin, 1896.

Annals of Connaught, ed.A.M.Freeman, Dublin, 1944.

Annals of Inisfallen, ed.S.Mac Airt, Dublin, 1951.

Annals of Loch Cé, ed. W.M.Hennessy, London, 1871.

Annals of Ulster, ed.W.M.Hennessy, Dublin, 1887, for H.M.S.O.

Translations of Travelogues and Histories

Seon Maundauil, ed.W.Stokes in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 2, 1899, pp.1-63, 226-312.

Ser Marco Polo, ed.W.Stokes in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 1,1897, pp.245-73, 362-438.

Sdair na Lumbardach, ed.G.Mac Niocaill in *Studia Hibernica* 1, 1961, pp.89-118.

Other Literary Comparanda

Acallam na Senorach, ed.W.Stokes, *Irische Texte, Vierte Serie* 1, Leipzig, 1900.

J.Carney, *Poems on the O'Reillys*, Dublin, 1950.

D.Greene & F.Kelly, *Irish Bardic Poetry*, Dublin, 1970.

L.McKenna, *Aithdioghluim Dána*, Irish Texts' Society vol. 37, Dublin, 1939.

L.McKenna, *Dan Dé*, Dublin, 1922.

L.McKenna, *Dánta Philip Bhoicht*, Dublin, 1931.

L.McKenna, *Dioghluim Dána*, Dublin, 1938

L.McKenna, 'Historical Poems of Gofraidh Fionn Ó Dálaigh (†1387)' in *Irish Monthly* 67, 1919, pp.1-5, 102-7, 166-70, 224-8, 283-6, 341-4, 397-403, 455-9, 509-14, 563-9, 622-6.

A.O'Sullivan, *Poems on the Marcher Lords*, Irish Texts' Society vol.53, Dublin, 1987.

Sechrán na Banimpire, ed.C.Marstrander, *Ériu* 5, 1911, pp.161-99.

G.Murphy, 'Two Irish Poems Written from the Mediterranean in the Thirteenth Century' in *Éigse* 7, 1953-5, pp.71-9.

Hiberno-Latin Comparanda

Annals

Annals in Add. MS. 4792, ed.J.T.Gilbert in *Chartularies of St. Mary's Abbey* 2, London, 1884, pp.293-302.

Annals of the Blessed Virgin Mary Monastery, ed.J.T.Gilbert in *Chartularies of St. Mary's Abbey* 2, London, 1884, pp.241-86.

Annals of Christ Church, ed.A.Gwynn in *Analecta Hibernica* 16, 1946, pp.313-37.

Annals of Duisk, ed.K.W.Nicholls in *Peritia* 2, 1983, pp.92-102.

Annals of Jacobus Grace, ed.R.Butler, *Annales Hiberniae*, Irish Archaeological Society, Dublin, 1842.

Annals of John Clyn, ed.R.Butler, Irish Archaeological Society, Dublin, 1849.

Annals in MS. Laud 526, ed.J.T.Gilbert in *Chartularies of St. Mary's Abbey* 2, London, 1884, pp.303-98.

Annals of Stephen Dexter (also called *Annals of Multyfarnham*), ed.A.Smith, Dublin 1842.

Kilkenny Chronicle, ed.R.Flower, *Analecta Hibernica* 2, 1931, pp.330-340.

Hiberno-Latin Travelogue

Itinerarium Simon Semeonis, ed.M.Esposito, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* vol.4, Dublin, 1960.